Class 283 P Book Sch 89
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK
The Rev. Wm. C. Hicks

Studies in English Church History

Studies in English Church History

FIVE LECTURES

BY THE

REV. HAMILTON SCHUYLER, M.A.

CANON OF DAVENPORT CATHEDRAL

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY THE

REV. THOMAS RICHEY, S.T.D.

ST. MARK'S-IN-THE-BOWERIE, PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

NEW YORK

CROTHERS & KORTH

246 FOURTH AVENUE

1896

283 P
Sch 89

110125

MAINE STATE LIBRARY
AUGUSTA
NOW WEN

COPYRIGHT, 1896
BY
CROTHERS & KORTH

TROW DIRECTORY
PRINTING AND BOOKBINDING COMPANY
NEW YORK

TO

C. D. W.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE, ... ix

INTRODUCTION, ... xiii

LECTURE I.

THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN BRITAIN, . . . 1

LECTURE II.

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH AND ROMAN SUPREMACY, . 26

LECTURE III.

THE REFORMATION—ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS, . . 56

LECTURE IV.

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF DISSENT, ... 85

LECTURE V.

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC REVIVAL, ... 118

PREFACE

THESE studies represent a series of lectures delivered before the congregation of Trinity Church, Newport, R. I., during the Lenten season of 1895. The interest manifested by those who heard them, or who read a summary published at the time in a local newspaper, has led me to believe that they might prove useful to a larger circle.

There is, of course, no lack of good books on the subjects with which the lectures deal. There are several complete histories of the English Church, and also many books dealing with the several topics upon which I have written. There is not, however, so far as I know, any brief treatise in a popular vein which covers the same ground. The student of Church History will presumably find nothing in these papers with which he is not familiar. They are designed rather to appeal to that

large class of Churchmen to be found in every parish, who, though otherwise well informed, are often deficient in knowledge of the history of the Church to which they belong. Such persons often lack the time or inclination to study extensive and erudite works, but may easily be induced to read a small volume.

I have not thought it necessary to give the authorities to whom I am indebted for the historical facts, or to mention by name the many writers whose thoughts, and in some instances whose words, I have used. A partial list of the various books read and consulted is appended.* I refer the reader to these as the

* Bright: *Early English Church History.* Bryce: *The Holy Roman Empire.* Gore: *The Church and the Ministry; Roman Catholic Claims.* Garnier: *The Title-deeds of the Church of England.* Blunt: *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology.* Cutts: *Turning-points of General Church History; Turning-points of English Church History.* Hardwick: *History of the Reformation.* Blunt: *The Reformation in England.* Hore: *History of the Church of England.* Howard: *The Church of England and other Religious Communions.* Curteis: *Dissent in Relation to the Church of England.* Church: *The Oxford Movement.* Newman: *Apologia Pro Vita Sua:* Wilfred Ward: *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement. Church Club Lectures*, series of 1889, 1890, 1894.

chief sources of my own information. Wherever I have consciously or unconsciously appropriated an idea or borrowed a phrase, I desire in this general way to acknowledge my obligation. The first lecture will be found to contain a sufficient introduction to the general subject.

H. S.

Cathedral Close, Davenport, Ia.,
Feast of the Epiphany, 1896.

INTRODUCTION

THESE lectures, first prepared for parochial use, have been thought, by those who heard them, worthy of a more extended circulation. It is with pleasure that, at the request of the writer, I add my testimony to their value, as furnishing, on the whole, an impartial view of the subjects under consideration.

Whatever theory we may adopt regarding the introduction of Christianity into Britain, it is conceded, even by a historian like Mr. Green,* that while the Celtic Church contributed not a little to the infusion of that evangelical element which has always been a marked characteristic of Anglican Christianity, the English Church owes a debt of obligation to Augustine and Theodore of Tarsus for bringing it into closer contact with Roman civilization and Roman organization. I know of no better illustration than that which the history of the Church of England affords, of the value which a living organism has over a written

* Making of England, Chapter VII.

Constitution, in its power of adaptability to new conditions, and its ability to live and survive under the manifold changes of national growth and development. The Celtic Bishop, —anomalous as it may appear—was without jurisdiction, the inmate of a monastery under an abbot, and preferred to live on an island apart; his Saxon successor had his bishop's stool in a village in preference to a city; while the Norman prelate was by birth and association closely allied to the Court, lived in a palace, and chose the city rather than an island or a village: he was a politician and a legislator, a builder of great cathedrals, and a founder of schools of learning. The explanation is that the Celtic Bishop adapted himself to the tribal condition of the people among whom he dwelt, the Saxon followed the fashion of the Saxons themselves in preferring the village to the town, the Norman prelate was for the most part nobly born, sometimes of the blood royal, and naturally fitted to exercise a sanctifying influence, not over nomadic tribes only, or simple village folk, but to preside in the councils of the nation, and claim his place as a political factor in affairs of state.

The view presented of the Middle Ages in these lectures is that now generally accepted by all historians of good repute. Feudalism, compared with representative government, under the forms of a limited monarchy or a republic, had undoubtedly its defects; but regarded in the light of an educational institution for keeping under control, and modelling into shape the new races, which had taken possession of the old Roman Empire at the time in Western Europe, feudalism was of infinite value. It made men, and taught respect for women; had it given to us nothing else than the three things symbolized by the three words—page, lady, lord—modern civilization owes to it a debt of infinite gratitude.

Of the Reformation it may be said that it was not, as some would have it, a passing phase of religious opinion merely, but, in the broadest meaning of the word, a re-formation of both Church and State, in the transition from the old order to the new. If it has pleased Almighty God in His wise Providence to give to the people of the Old World, when suffering from poverty and trampled under foot by an arbitrary exercise of power, a New World where the

nations of the earth may start afresh in a fresh career of progress and development, it is surely the duty, as it is the privilege, of the Church to make proof of her being an organism divinely created, and not the offspring of a paper constitution, however wisely framed, by stirring up the gift that is in her, to adapt herself in the future, as she has done in the past, to new conditions, and guide and direct the nation to the proper discharge of the trust committed to it. If "Providence rules," as Æschylus has it, "in the gift of a name," then we may be permitted to regard our own special mission to be pointed out, in the maintaining of the integrity of the state as divinely constituted of God in its own sphere; and the bringing back again, under the ameliorating influence of new relationships, the erring children who, in a moment of temporary irritation, have forsaken their mother and their home, to the acknowledging of the same "Lord Jesus Christ, of Whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named" (Eph. iii. 14, 15).

THOMAS RICHEY.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
FEAST OF ALL SAINTS, 1895.

LECTURE I.

THE PLANTING OF THE CHURCH IN BRITAIN

It is manifestly impossible, in five lectures limited to half an hour each, to treat with anything approaching completeness so vast a subject as English Church History. Indeed, each one of the five themes to which attention is asked would rightfully demand much more space than can be given to the whole number. These lectures are to be regarded, therefore, simply as sketches or outlines. As such they may be useful in indicating the nature and richness of the soil which lies beneath the surface. Their object is, if I may so speak, simply to uncover the vein of golden ore and to give a few hints as to the direction in which may be found the most profitable field for personal research and study. Let me add, what will certainly become evident as we proceed, that these lectures make no claim to originality. Free use

has been made of the thoughts of others and sometimes of their words. All that can be claimed for these brief sketches is that they are based upon a careful and painstaking study of the questions at issue. I dare not assert that they are wholly free from bias; I apprehend that few can treat history with an entire elimination of the personal equation; yet I have endeavored to be fair, and have not knowingly misrepresented any facts.

Certainly, to those who are members of the Anglican Communion, there can be no more fruitful field for historical study than that of English Church History. Our own Church is the lineal descendant of the Church of England. She is our mother, and as such we owe it to ourselves to know something of her past history. She has been, and she is to-day, the greatest factor in the formation of Anglo-Saxon life and character. It is no extravagant statement to say that the English Church has made the English nation. The Church was in existence in England in a highly organized form before the State, strictly speaking, had

been founded. The State was formed on the lines marked out by the Church. While the Church and the State were never merged into one, the connection between them has always been of the closest character. The Church has always been in England the Church of the People. There has always been the deepest sympathy between the Church and the people of England as a whole. The sterling honesty and independence which are the marked characteristics of the English race are no less the distinguishing qualities of the Church. Undoubtedly there have been times when the religious life of the nation was at a very low ebb, and beyond question the Church has at times suffered herself to forget her duties and responsibilities. She has at intervals been lax in discipline and formal in spirit, and has thus given just occasion for men to reproach her with lukewarmness and conformity to the world; but she has ever been ready to confess her sins, and has never lacked prophets whose call to repentance and amendment has aroused her to better things.

The cause of civil and religious liberty throughout the world is under lasting obligation to the Church of England, while her conservative spirit has made her the strongest exponent of the principles of law and order. The spirit of colonization inherent in the Anglo-Saxon race has enabled the Church of England to make her influence felt in distant countries, and among peoples of the most diverse character and training. The unrivalled beauty and strength of her translation of the Holy Scriptures, and the chaste and devotional spirit of her Book of Common Prayer, have moulded the thought and directed the religious expression of millions, not only within her own borders but in other and distant lands. Literature owes her a debt which can hardly be overestimated. All the great writers, from Chaucer to Tennyson, have drunk deep of her spirit, and reflect the moral earnestness, candor, and simplicity of her character. Science owes much to her liberality and zeal for truth. The cause of popular education is also her debtor to no small extent.

In practical philanthropy and missionary enterprise she holds an important place. Even the various sects which have from time to time gone out from her Communion owe to the English Church whatever measure of evangelical truth they have preserved, though they now repudiate her authority and seek to minimize her claims.

It is not too much to say that if the scattered sheep of Christ's flock are ever to be reunited in one fold, the Church of England presents the only rallying ground; for she alone has points of contact with the great Roman and Eastern Churches, and is bound at the same time by ties of kindred and sympathy to the various sectarian bodies. With Rome and the East she holds fast to the ancient order and the historic creeds, and with the sects she stands for individual liberty and the cause of popular education.

We cannot doubt that the preservation of the Catholic faith from all modern encroachments, and the cause of sound morality and Christian education, are largely committed

to her trust. The renewed life and spiritual enthusiasm which are apparent within her borders are signs that she is conscious of her destiny.

It is only by a careful and diligent study of her past history, by a candid review of her sins and failings, as well as by an intelligent appreciation of her virtues, that we of the American Church can rise to a full sense of the debt of gratitude which we owe, personally and as a body, to our Spiritual Mother, the Church of England.

When and by whom was Christianity first introduced into England, or Britain as it was then called? No satisfactory answer to this question has ever been given. It is supposed by some that the Gospel was first preached here by St. Paul; but there is no good evidence to support this theory, which has probably arisen from a strong desire to boast an apostolic founder. We must also set down as purely mythical the story that St. Joseph of Arimathæa came to Britain bringing with him

the Holy Graal, or cup, in which our Lord instituted the Eucharist.

Undoubtedly, there were individual Christians in Britain at a very early date. The island was conquered and occupied by the Romans in the year 78 A.D., and it is fair to assume—knowing how widespread Christianity was at this time—that there were a few Christians among the invaders. It is probable, however, that no attempt was made to convert the natives; at least, we have no evidence of such a thing. The more likely supposition is that the work of evangelization was begun by members of the Gallican Church. While Gaul, as a whole, was not christianized until the middle or end of the third century, there were churches in Lyons and Vienne as early as 150 A.D. It is more than probable that the fierce persecution which befell these churches in the year 177, caused many Gallican Christians to pass over to Britain. The similarity between the Gallican Church and the ancient British Church in certain rites and observances, which were possibly derived from the Eastern Church, is

strong evidence that the Gallican Church had very early impressed itself upon British Christianity.

There is a gap extending from the end of the second to the beginning of the fourth century. For one hundred years we have no information regarding the progress of Christianity in Britain. Early in the fourth century we have the most abundant evidence that the Church was firmly planted in the island in a regularly organized form with bishops, priests, and deacons; a Church recognized by the other Churches of Christendom.

In the year 303 was commenced the last of the ten great persecutions against the Christians, known as the Diocletian Persecution. It was in this persecution that St. Alban, who is honored as the great proto-martyr of England, met his death. The story is romantic and touching. Alban, or Albanus, was a person of noble birth, and, perhaps, an officer in the Roman army belonging to the garrison of Verulam. A priest fleeing from persecution besought Alban, then a pagan, to shelter him.

Alban did so, out of pure humanity; and on closer intercourse was so impressed with his piety, and the truth and beauty of his teaching, that he became himself a convert to the Christian faith and received baptism. When the hiding-place of the priest was discovered, Alban disguised himself in the priest's cassock and surrendered himself in the place of his guest to the soldiers. His identity was soon discovered, and as it was a crime to shelter a Christian, Alban was dragged before the judge. Being called upon to sacrifice to the gods and abjure Christianity, he refused. He was then put to torture, and led forth to execution. The soldier who was to perform this office was so touched by Alban's exhibition of steadfastness that he threw down the sword, and prayed that he might suffer with him, or, if possible, in his stead. Both were put to death, as was also the priest whom Alban had sheltered. The scene of the martyrdom was Verulam, to which afterward was given the name St. Albans.

In the year 313, Constantine promulgated the Edict of Toleration; and henceforth Christian-

ity in Britain and elsewhere had nothing to fear from the Government.

We have now arrived at the age of councils, and the presence of British bishops at these assemblies testifies to the existence of an organized Church in Britain. At the Council of Arles, in 314, the names of three bishops representing the British Church are recorded. At the great Council of Nice, in 325, which was held to refute the heresy of Arius, we have no record of the presence of any British bishops; but we know from other sources that the British Church assented to the decision of the Council. In 363 we find Athanasius, the great champion of the orthodox faith, reckoning the Britons among those who were loyal to it. St. Chrysostom speaks of "the unanimity of the Churches of the British Isles." St. Jerome, in 390, says that "Britain worships the same Church and observes the same Rule of Faith as other Nations."

But the Christianity so auspiciously begun in Britain was destined to be almost blotted out. In the year 411 the Roman legions were recalled

from Britain, to aid in the defence of Rome against the attacks of the barbarian hordes which threatened the life of the Empire. The Britons, suddenly deprived of their protectors, found themselves unable to repel the incursions of the Picts and Scots, and adopted the fatal policy of calling in the Saxons to their aid. These Teutonic tribes, Saxons and Angles, were famous pirates, and had long looked with envious eyes upon the rich and fertile country of the Britons. They readily accepted the invitation; but they proved themselves false allies, for no sooner had they driven out the Picts and Scots than they proceeded to wrest the control of the country from the Britons themselves, and drove them back into the recesses of Wales and Cornwall.

The Germanic tribes which settled in the country were pure heathens, worshippers of Woden and other false gods. The churches and monasteries, of which there were many, were destroyed; the clergy and people were slain; and the civilization and Christianity which had existed for three hundred years

were almost wholly wiped out. Attempts to dislodge the British Christians, who had taken refuge in Wales, proved unsuccessful, and the two races henceforth lived side by side and carried on a desultory warfare.

Christianity and the Church still survived among the Britons, but this period is so obscured by myth and fiction that it is difficult to compile any authentic history. We know, however, that famous schools and monasteries existed, and the names of certain British saints have come down to us. Of these the most prominent is St. David, who flourished in the latter half of the sixth century. There are four sees now existing in Wales which can be traced as far back as the end of the sixth century. These are Llandaff, St. David's, Bangor, and St. Asaph. Thus it will be seen that the Welsh bishoprics are the oldest section of the Anglican Church.

Before we take up the subject of the conversion of the Saxons by Roman missionaries, it will be well to consider briefly the influence of the Celtic Church upon Christianity in Eng-

land. We are apt to think that the whole credit of evangelizing England is due to Rome, and we forget how large a debt is owing to the Celtic forerunners.

It is to St. Patrick that Ireland owes Christianity. The history of this remarkable man is so veiled in legend that it is difficult to get at the actual facts. It is probable that St. Patrick was born in 387 in Northern Britain, in the country which we now call Scotland. His father, Calphurnius, is said to have been a deacon, and his grandfather a priest; while his mother, tradition tells us, was a sister of St. Martin of Tours. When he was about sixteen years old, he, among others, was carried into captivity by a band of Irish marauders who infested the coast. For several years he was a slave, but eventually made his escape. The desire to convert to Christianity those among whom he had passed a number of years as a captive burned within him, and he set out to study at the monasteries of Southern Gaul to prepare himself for the work. He spent twenty years there in study, but always kept in mind

his vow to go as a missionary to the Irish. When he had reached his forty-second year, Providence seemed to have opened a way for the accomplishment of his lifelong desire. A certain priest, Palladius by name, had been sent out by Pope Celestine as a missionary to Ireland; but the task was too much for him and he returned to Rome, reporting the failure of his mission. St. Patrick went to Ireland to take up the work which Palladius had abandoned, and labored many years with great success among the wild Irish tribes. St. Patrick died in 465. He is reckoned as the Patron Saint of Ireland. The Roman claim that he was sent out by the Pope cannot be substantiated. As he was educated in Gaul, it is probable that he received his consecration as bishop there.

The Christianity introduced by St. Patrick had a precarious life, and at one time was nearly extinguished. In its distress the Irish Church implored aid from the British Church, which was given; and the result was a great revival of religion. As time went on, the Irish

Church became a great centre of religious life and learning. The fame of its monasteries attracted many scholars from Europe, and from its schools went forth a noble band of missionaries who carried the Gospel not only to Scotland, but also to France, Germany, Switzerland, to Northern Italy, and even to Iceland.

It is to a missionary, trained in one of the monasteries founded by St. Patrick, that Scotland is largely debtor for the planting of Christianity within her borders. To St. Columba belongs pre-eminently the title of the Apostle of Scotland. This saintly man, the abbot of an Irish monastery and the founder of thirty-seven churches in Ireland, crossed over to Scotland in the year 563, with twelve companions, for the purpose of founding a mission among the Northern Picts. The king of the country bestowed upon him the little island of Iona. Here St. Columba founded a monastery, which soon became famous and from which went forth missionaries through whom the Saxons in the northern part of England received the Gospel. Thus we may say that, in a certain

sense, the Church of Ireland was the mother of the Church of England.

Up to the time of the death of St. Columba, in 597, no attempt had been made to christianize the Saxons. The ancient British Church was still in existence in Wales, but being the Church of the conquered race it could hardly hope to impress its religion upon the heathen Saxons. But help was to come from another quarter.

Who does not know the touching story of Pope Gregory the Great, and the Saxon youths exhibited for sale as slaves in the market-place of Rome? It was in the year 578, or thereabouts, that Gregory, then archdeacon of the Roman Church, passing through the slave market, was attracted by the sight of three fair-haired boys with ruddy complexion, who were exposed for sale by their owner. A type so different from the dark-complexioned youths of Italy, called forth a question from Gregory as to the country of their birth. Their owner answered, "From Britain; the people there have these fair complexions."

"Are they heathens or Christians?" anxiously asked Gregory. "Heathens." "Alas," he sighed, "that such bright faces should be in the power of the prince of darkness! that with outward forms so lovely, the mind within should be sick and empty of grace! How do you call their nation?" "Angles." Then, with that fondness for playing on words which in good men often veils a serious thought, he replied, "'Tis well, they have angel faces. It is meet that they should be fellow-heirs with the angels in heaven. What is their native province?" "Deira" (now to be identified with Yorkshire). "Then they must be rescued *de ira Dei*" (from the wrath of God), said he. One more question: "Who was their king?" "Aella." "Alleluia, praise to God the Maker ought to be sung in those parts."

Gregory passed on, and probably never saw the Saxon youths again; but the incident had made a strong impression upon his mind. He resolved to leave Rome and go as a missionary to this distant island of Britain. He actually did start on his journey, but was prevented by

the expostulations and entreaties of his friends and fellow-citizens. The Pope, Benedict I., ordered him to remain. So much, indeed, was he esteemed by the dignitaries of the Church and beloved by the people for the sweetness and gentleness of his character and his rare wisdom and power of administration, that on the death of the Pope, Gregory was elevated to the Papacy by the unanimous voice of clergy and people.

Immediately upon his accession, Gregory found himself immersed in business of all sorts, controversies with heretics, matters of practical administration, reforms of abuses, and other things of pressing importance. It was, therefore, not until 596 that he found opportunity to initiate a plan for the conversion of Britain, though undoubtedly the memory of those fair-haired heathen boys never wholly passed out of his mind. It was probably in the spring of 596 that Gregory sent forth on a missionary enterprise to Britain, Augustine, the prior of a monastery which Gregory had himself founded, and forty monks. Travel in

those days, as we may imagine, was a very different thing from what it is to-day. The little band met with many hardships and discouragements before they reached the end of their journey. Indeed, on their arrival in Provence they heard such tales of the cruelty of the Saxons, that his companions implored Augustine to return to Rome and petition Gregory to excuse them from a work so full of perils and uncertainties. Augustine made his way back to Rome, only to have Gregory firmly but kindly refuse to grant the request. "It were better," said he, "not to begin a good work than to begin it and turn back from it. You have undertaken this work by the Lord's help; carry it out with activity and fervor, knowing that much labor wins all the greater reward." Augustine returned to his companions, strengthened and refreshed by this counsel, and the journey was continued.

Augustine and his monks landed on the Isle of Thanet in the spring of 597. He sent a message to the king of the country to this effect, that they were come from Rome with the best

of all messages, and that if he would accept it he would undoubtedly insure himself an everlasting kingdom. Ethelbert, the Kentish king, replied, appointing a day for a meeting, which he stipulated should be held in the open air, for he feared that Augustine might ensnare him with spells if the meeting were held under a roof. The chances of a favorable hearing were enhanced by the fact that Ethelbert had espoused in marriage Bertha, a daughter of a former Frankish king, Charibert of Paris. Bertha was a Christian, and one of the conditions of her marriage was that she should be permitted to practise her religion and retain the services of her chaplain, Luinhard. To this Ethelbert agreed, and he never interfered with his wife in this respect.

On the day appointed for the meeting, King Ethelbert and his thanes took their seats under a wide-spreading oak-tree. Augustine and his monks appeared in solemn procession, chanting a litany, with a large silver cross borne before them. The strange spectacle had its effect upon the heathen king and his followers. He

listened attentively to the preaching of Augustine, who was assisted by a Gallic interpreter. The King replied: "Fair words and promises are these; but seeing that they are new and doubtful, I cannot give in to them and give up what I, with the English race, have so long observed. But since you have come a long way from a strange country, in order—as I think I clearly see—to make known to us what you believe to be best and truest, we do not mean to do you any harm; but will rather treat you kindly, and take care that you have all you need; and we shall not hinder you from bringing over any of our people to your belief."

The King set apart for the use of the Italians an old British church in Canterbury, which we know as St. Martin's; and thus was laid the foundation of the Saxon Church. A year later, Ethelbert was baptized; the council approved the new religion, and the people in large numbers followed the King's example.

Augustine, having met with so great a measure of success, and acting under the instruction

of Pope Gregory, went to Gaul, where he was consecrated Archbishop of England by the Metropolitan of Arles. On his return, Ethelbert restored for the use of the mission an old British church in the city of Canterbury, to which was given the name of Christ Church. This name still belongs to the Cathedral of Canterbury, which occupies the spot. The Pope received with joy the news of the progress made, and sent out four new missionaries and a supply of sacred vessels, altar cloths, vestments, and books, for the use of the mission.

It was not long before Augustine learned of the existence of the ancient British Church and sought to come to an understanding with its bishops. A conference was arranged. The British Church, it should be said, differed from other sections of the Western Church in certain matters of minor importance, such as the mode of administering baptism and the time of observing Easter. Augustine insisted that the British Church should conform to the Roman customs and abandon its ancient usage. This

the British bishops refused to do; neither would they accept Augustine as their archbishop. It is probable that Augustine, representing as he did the great Patriarchal See of Rome, displayed no little arrogance toward the British bishops, and thus fortified them in their determination not to enter into union with the mission he had founded. The breach thus created was not healed for many years. Augustine died on May 26, 604, two months after the death of Pope Gregory.

The Church thus established among the Saxons in Kent underwent many vicissitudes; but it survived, and through its influence the Christian religion was introduced into other kingdoms of the Saxon Heptarchy.

It is not within the scope of these lectures to detail the subsequent growth of the Church in the various provinces of England. Suffice it to say that the several kingdoms were gradually converted to Christianity, and that bishoprics were established in the chief cities.

The Church of England undoubtedly owes a great and lasting debt to Gregory and to Augus-

tine. It is to them that the credit is due for inaugurating a mission to the heathen Saxons and for establishing closer relations between the British Isles and continental Christendom. The Roman genius for organization was also a potent factor in unifying the scattered elements of Christianity which existed on the island, and thus was paved the way for the consolidation of the various kingdoms into one nation.

But while a great debt is due to Rome, we must not forget that the Celtic Church also deserves our gratitude. No small share in the evangelization of Britain belongs to the Irish branch of this Church. The great kingdom of Northumbria, which had first received Christianity from Roman sources, soon lapsed into heathenism, and was reclaimed by Celtic missionaries from Iona. Wales was already a Christian land, under the ancient British Church.

The unification of these three elements was finally accomplished under Theodore, who became Archbishop of Canterbury in the latter part of the seventh century. It was under him

that the Celtic Church finally accepted the customs and ceremonials of the Western Church and became, with the Roman mission, merged into one organic body, which we may henceforth call the Church of England.

LECTURE II.

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH AND ROMAN SUPREMACY

The period, roughly speaking, to which we commonly assign the term "Mediæval," stretches from the eighth century to the fifteenth, or to the dawn of the Reformation. We sometimes give to this period the name of the "Dark Ages." Undoubtedly, there are many good reasons for such a designation; still, I cannot help thinking that we are prone to over-estimate the character and extent of the moral and intellectual darkness which then prevailed. Comparing, as we are apt to do, the civilization of our own times, with its general, if somewhat superficial, education of the common people, to the state of things that we find in the Middle Ages, we hastily conclude there was then a total eclipse of knowledge and morality.

Unquestionably the mass of the people was sunk in ignorance and superstition. Such a thing as public opinion, the most potent factor in all reforms, was wholly unknown. The Feudal System had the effect of crushing out the liberty and independence of the individual. The personality of the common people was little respected; they were simply slaves, or serfs, under the tyrannical rule of the nobles. Of property, strictly speaking, they had none. Human life was held in small reverence. Kings were believed to rule by divine right, and plunged their nations into bloody wars to gratify their personal ambition or caprice. Of course, such a state of things precluded the spread of knowledge outside of a very limited class.

The civilization which the Roman Empire had given to the world had been nearly extinguished in the general catastrophe caused by the invasion and occupation of the land by the Northern barbarians. The old stock, enfeebled by luxury and shorn of all power, disappeared, or was absorbed by the conquer-

ing races. Everything, or almost everything, which is understood by civilization, seemed to have perished in the general wreck. It was a period of transition, and order had not yet come out of the chaos. A new and better civilization was struggling to the birth, and the interval was marked by the pains of travail. Yet the lamp of knowledge was not wholly extinguished; man was then, as at all times, seeking the light. Man is a social being, and society can exist only where the obligations of law and order are recognized. The necessity invariably produces the man. So it was that such men as Charlemagne, in Europe, and Alfred, in England, set themselves to the task of reorganizing society, and rebuilding the fabric of civilization which had been thrown down.

In this great work they found a most sympathetic and powerful ally in the Church. It is customary to refer to the Church of this period as corrupt and superstitious. Such in great measure it undoubtedly was; yet it was within the Church, and within the Church

only, that there resided the power to raise society from the slough of ignorance and disorder into which it had sunk.

Dean Church, in his luminous little book, "The Beginning of the Middle Ages," makes this fact apparent. His words are as follows: "Amid the ruins of the greatest pride and the greatest strength that the world had known, the Church alone stood erect and strong. In days when men relied only on force and violence, yet only to discover time after time that force alone could not give nor secure power, the Church ruled by persuasion, by example, by knowledge, by its higher view of life, by its obstinate hope and visible beneficence, by its confidence in innocence, by its call to peace. The Church had faith in itself and its mission when all other faith had broken down. It might be afflicted and troubled by the disasters of the time, but its work was never arrested by them nor its courage abated. It still offered shelter and relief among the confusion, even after war had broken into its sanctuaries and the sword had slaughtered its ministers;

it still persisted in holding out the light from heaven when the air was filled with storm and darkness. . . .

"The immense influence of Christianity and the Church on the new nations is one of those mixed and complicated facts which it is hard adequately to exhibit, much less to analyze completely. It was the source of good and guarantee of progress to them; it carried with it the promise and hope of a nobler future. But the immediate effect of the contact of the barbarians with Christianity was to lower and injure Christianity. Christianity raised them, but it suffered itself in the effort. The clergy, and those responsible for the care of religion in rude and disordered states of society, are often hardly judged by those who live in calmer and more experienced times. During the worst of the wild days which followed the Teutonic conquest, there were always to be found men deeply impressed with the sense of right, and with the truth and greatness of the Divine Government, full of zeal for righteousness and disinterested love for their brethren;

men who taught these lessons, and men who received them in sincerity.

"Socially, the Church as such was always on the side of peace, on the side of industry, on the side of purity, on the side of liberty for the slave, and protection for the oppressed. The monasteries were the only keepers of literary tradition; they were still more, great agricultural colonies, clearing the wastes, and setting the example of improvement. They were the only seats of human labor which could hope to be spared in those lands of perpetual wars. In the religious teachings of the clergy, the great outlines and facts of the Christian creed were strongly and firmly drawn; and they were never obliterated, though often confused, by lower and meaner admixtures. It was impossible to forget the Cross of Christ; the appeal to Our Father went up in numberless tongues and dialects all over the West, from the ignorant and miserable and from the barbarian warrior and perhaps his victim."

In the ninth and tenth centuries the Church

probably reached the lowest level to which it has ever fallen. A majority of the bishops were, in a sense, ecclesiastical warriors, who held their benefices as fiefs of their king. Those who should have been the shepherds of the people and set the example of peace and purity, were often the chief inciters to strife and the most shameless exponents of profligacy. The chief Sees of Christendom were prizes to be clutched at, not only for the political power which their possession conferred, but also for the opportunity offered to secure great revenue. Thus simony in its worst forms was rife; and the oppression and exploitation of the common people, upon whom the burden of raising the funds mainly rested, followed as a matter of course.

The Roman See, the chief See of Christendom, naturally became the foremost mark for personal ambition, and affords the most terrible example of the corruption into which the Church of Christ had fallen. Baronius, one of the great Roman Catholic historians, describes the Church during this period as "exceedingly

foul." He says that "no less than fifty popes succeeded each other on the pontifical throne, of whom many received possession of it by fraud, by money, or by worse expedients. And many of them lived lives of open and shameless profligacy."

But this state of things was too bad to continue, and both clergy and laity called out loudly for reform. The popes of the eleventh century put themselves at the head of the reforming party; and it is largely to this fact that we must attribute the growth and prevalence of the idea of Papal Supremacy, which began at this time to take definite shape. Many of the best men saw, or thought they saw, that the only remedy for the existing abuses lay in concentrating power in the hands of the Pope. A strong central force whose authority was everywhere respected, seemed to be the only refuge against the corruption of the times; and kings and nobles who would respect no other authority had great regard for that of the Roman See.

It is easy to understand how this feeling grew

up. Rome was the only Apostolic See in the West. It was believed that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and the pre-eminence ascribed to that apostle passed on to his successors. Again, Rome was, and continued for many years to be, the chief city of Christendom and of the world. It was, in the days of the Empire, the seat of secular authority, and the final court of appeals. For centuries the world had looked to Rome as the centre of power. After the fall of the Empire, the Roman genius for organization impressed itself upon the new nations, and Roman law remained as the groundwork of legislation. Imperial Rome vanished as an active force in the world, but the Roman spirit still survived. The prestige of a mighty name remained; and this prestige passed over, in a great degree, to the popes. They were regarded in some sense as successors to the Cæsars, who, it will be remembered, claimed to be supreme not only in secular matters, but in matters of religion as well. Under the Empire, religion was the affair of the State, and the emperor was Pontifex Maximus, or chief pon-

tiff. The popes fell heir to this twofold office, and it was therefore natural that they should acquire a preponderating influence in secular as well as ecclesiastical matters. It is not strange that when disputes arose between bishops of other provinces or countries, the Pope should be chosen to act as umpire. For precisely the same reasons, kings and princes who disagreed often called upon the Pope to settle their disputes.

What was first yielded to the Bishop of Rome from considerations of courtesy and practical utility, was afterward demanded by him as of divine right. Rome came to regard herself as the supreme arbitrator of Christendom, and this claim was pressed to the utmost limit by such men as Alexander II. and Hildebrand. Hildebrand, indeed, went farther than any of his predecessors. Universal sovereignty was his aim. He would establish a universal theocracy with the Pope at the head, supreme over all kings, the Vicar of Christ on earth. The idea was in one sense a magnificent one. Assuming that Papal Supremacy was of divine right—that is, that St. Peter had been made

ruler of the Church over all the other apostles, and that the popes were successors of St. Peter and inherited his peculiar privileges—the rest followed as a matter of course. As Supreme Head of the Church, the Pope would have all Christians under his rule. Kings were simply rulers over sections of Christendom, and were therefore sons of the Church and subject to the Pope.

It is hardly necessary to point out that such an idea of the Papacy has no support from Scripture or early history. It rests on a series of assumptions that have no basis in fact. There is nothing more certain than that our Lord did not intend that the spiritual rulers of His Church should exercise the functions of the secular sovereign. The Roman theologians have always found great difficulty in explaining adequately such texts as these: "My Kingdom is not of this world." "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; the powers that be are ordained of God."

There were two methods by which the popes endeavored to enforce their authority; one was to commission a certain sovereign or sovereigns to undertake a war against a refractory prince, and thus compel his obedience; the second and more common method was to pronounce sentence of excommunication upon the offender; or, in the case of a nation, to lay it under an interdict. How effective this method of procedure was, we can understand when we reflect how seriously men in those days regarded the censures of the Church. In the case of the excommunication of a sovereign, in addition to being cut off from the body of the faithful, his subjects were absolved from their obedience to him, and any one might deprive him of his crown or life without incurring the Church's censure; indeed, such an act was regarded as pious. In the case of an interdict, the nation as a whole was deprived of all religious services and ministrations. In some exceptional cases, infants might be baptized, and the Eucharist given to the dying; but all other offices were suspended. No masses were said, no marriages

performed, no dead were buried. Of course, there was not always a strict practical enforcement of an interdict, but the threat of a Pope to lay a nation under it caused such an outcry from the clergy and people that generally the king was forced to submit.

Very often the king used the Pope to further schemes for oppressing his clergy and people, and very often the clergy and people appealed to the Pope against the encroachments by the sovereign upon their rights. Thus acting as arbitrator, now for one party, now for another, the Pope made his authority felt by all and increased his hold upon the country.

These considerations will place us in a position to understand better the history of the English Church at the period to which your attention is now directed.

Previous to the Norman Conquest (1066), there was comparatively little communication between the continental Churches and the Church of England. The insular character of the English Church and its remoteness from the city of Rome kept it from being involved in

the ecclesiastical quarrels and struggles that beset other national Churches. Moreover, this isolation had in some measure preserved the English Church from the moral corruption and doctrinal errors which had fastened themselves upon continental Churches.

The Church of England was at that time thoroughly national. It was Saxon to the core. The bishops and clergy were natives of the country; they were sprung from the people and were in sympathy with them. While the Church of England looked up to and venerated the Pope and the Church of Rome, she repudiated all notion of subjection to the See of Rome. In the course of the history of the Saxon Church only two appeals to Rome as a superior authority are recorded. One appeal was made by Wilfrid, Bishop of York, in the latter part of the seventh century. The Pope rendered a decision in his favor; but when Wilfrid returned to England and sought to have the decision enforced, the King and the Witan cast him into prison for his "treasonable conduct." It is evident, then, that in those days

the Supremacy of the Roman See was not acknowledged in England. The second appeal was in the days of Edward the Confessor. Archbishop Robert, a Norman, whom Edward had raised to the See of Canterbury, refused to consecrate the Abbot of Abingdon to the Bishopric of London, on the ground that he had been forbidden to do so by the Pope. Popular feeling was so inflamed by this action of the Archbishop that he was compelled to flee the country. He went to Rome and laid the case before the Pope. No notice was taken of this appeal by the Witan except to declare his See vacant, and to elevate the Bishop of Winchester to the Primacy in his place. Thus it will be seen how jealously the English people guarded what they believed to be their rights against any encroachment of the Papacy.

With the Norman Conquest an entirely new order of things came into being. The English Church lost its old distinctive character, and from that time we may date the rise and progress of the idea of Roman Supremacy over the national Church. The Normans at that time

were one of the foremost peoples of Europe. To the old Norse spirit of adventure and enterprise they united devotion to the Church and a zeal for learning. The Norman Conquest flung England into the current of continental life; impregnated the Church with European ideas, good and bad; and brought it under the influence of the great prevailing ecclesiastical movement of the day, namely, Papal Supremacy.

The conquest of England was undertaken, it will be remembered, directly under the auspices of the Pope. The Norman invaders had received the Pope's blessing on their enterprise, and had as their standard a banner blessed by him. The success of the expedition enabled the Pope to lay special claim to interfere in English matters. William had acknowledged the Pope's authority over the affairs of nations by craving his recognition of William's claim to the crown of England. Of this acknowledgment the Pope was not slow to remind him. Shortly after the conquest of the country, the Pope, Gregory VII., sent a nuncio to remind William that he should do homage for his crown,

and pay Peter's pence. Consistency and gratitude would seem to bind William to accede to the Pope's demands; but like many other people, William, having obtained what he wanted, was not eager to display those virtues. He acknowledged the Pope to be supreme in all matters purely ecclesiastical, but he refused utterly to recognize him in temporal matters. His blunt and peremptory reply to the Pope is on record, and is worth giving:

"Thy legate, Hubert, Holy Father, hath called upon me in thy name to take the oath of fealty to thee and to thy successors; and to exert myself in enforcing the more regular payment of money which my predecessors were accustomed to remit to the Church of Rome. One request I have granted; the other, I refuse. Homage to thee I have not chosen, nor do I choose, to do. I never made promise to that effect, nor do I find that it was ever performed by my predecessors to thine."

It is upon William, however, that the responsibility rests of acknowledging the

supremacy of the Pope in English Church matters. But if William wrought this great injury to the Church of England, he did much for its benefit. It is true that he appointed his Norman subjects to important places in the Church; but he did this, for the most part, as vacancies occurred. Only four native bishops and a few abbots were displaced. It was not long, however, in the natural course of events, before all the best places were in the hands of Normans. But William did not abuse his power, and his appointees, for the most part, were men of piety and learning. During his reign many abbeys and monasteries were founded, which became centres of learning and schools of instruction for the people. Certain changes and improvements were made in the method of rendering Divine service, and many abuses and disorders which had grown up in the Saxon Church were remedied.

England and the English Church are, moreover, indebted to the Normans for the erection of many noble cathedrals and church buildings. The infusion of new blood and new

ideas into the Church was on the whole a great gain. The cause of religion was advanced, and the standard of clerical life and character was raised.

One other great reform must be credited to William, and that was the separation of civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Hitherto all cases were brought before one tribunal. The cleric and the layman sat beside each other, and passed equally on civil and ecclesiastical questions. Of course, this system led to many abuses. William established two courts. This was a great gain to the Church as well as to the State; for it gave to the former the consciousness of a separate life, while it relieved the latter of a vast amount of business with which it was incompetent to deal. Later on, great abuses arose in connection with the existence of these separate tribunals. Clerical offenders against the common law of the land claimed the right to be tried in the ecclesiastical courts. Not only those in Holy Orders, but those designated generally as "clerks," who held any office or position in

the Church claimed this privilege, which was technically known as "Benefit of Clergy." All that it was necessary for a person accused of any crime to do, was to prove his right to exemption from the civil jurisdiction by reading a verse in the Latin Bible. This custom became a great scandal to the Church and impediment to justice. Criminals, cleric and lay, who could plead "Benefit of Clergy," were tried before the Bishop's court; and often, owing to the laxity of administration, received no adequate punishment for their crimes.

The long and fierce dispute between Henry II. and Becket was due to differences over this matter. The King demanded that when a clerk was proved guilty of a crime, he should be deprived of his orders and handed over to the King's officers to be punished as a layman. To this, which seems to us a perfectly just demand, Becket, as Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of the English Church, refused to accede. Becket appealed to the Pope, and a long controversy ensued. The Pope, after

much delay, gave his decision in favor of the Archbishop. Henry was greatly exasperated, and in a sudden fit of temper gave utterance to words which, being overheard by some of his train, resulted in the murder of the Archbishop in his cathedral at Canterbury. This bloody deed aroused all Europe. Henry was stricken with grief and remorse, and as evidence of the same, submitted to undergo most humiliating penance. Shortly after Becket's death came reports that miracles were wrought at his tomb, and Pope Alexander canonized him. The victory, if such it can be called, remained with the Church party; and it was not until the time of the Reformation that statutes making clerical offenders liable to the same punishment as others, were passed.

Another point of collision between the Church and the Crown was the matter of Investiture, or the right of the king to bestow the badge of office upon bishops and other dignitaries of the Church. The primitive manner of filling vacant Sees was similar to the custom of our American

Church. A bishop was elected by the clergy and people of the diocese. As, however, it was necessary for the man so elected to receive consecration from other bishops, the Metropolitan and bishops of the province exercised the right of veto. As time went on and the relations between Church and State grew more intimate, it became the custom for the king to exercise the power of appointment. There was a good reason for this, as in many cases a bishop was not only a spiritual lord, but exercised certain temporal powers also. Moreover, the land attached to a See was often considerable, and yielded a large revenue. Under the Feudal System all land, with the exception of Church land, was taxed for the purposes of the Crown, and was required to furnish a certain contingent of armed men. As a large and ever-increasing proportion of the land passed into the possession of the Church, this exemption became a serious evil. To remedy this the secular power demanded that bishops should be invested with the temporalities of their Sees by the Crown, and that they should be required to furnish

their quota of warriors. In other words, it was demanded that the bishops should hold their temporalities on the same tenure as the nobles; that is, as fiefs of the Crown. As symbols of Investiture, the king was accustomed to bestow upon them the ring and staff. This the bishops objected to, as these were symbols of their spiritual authority, which was not derived from the State. The Pope saw an opportunity to make capital for himself out of this matter, and warmly espoused the side of the clergy. As Head of the Church, the Pope sought to obtain control over the appointment of bishops. He denied to the sovereigns, and claimed for himself, the right of Investiture. The contest between the Papacy and the secular authorities on this subject lasted over fifty years, and occasioned many battles and the loss of many lives.

In England the controversy was the cause of endless friction between the clergy and sovereign. William Rufus and his brother and successor, Henry I., had a long dispute with Anselm, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who

stoutly defended the rights of his Order in this matter. Anselm went to Rome to lay the matter before the Pope. Henry intimated to him that he did not care for his return, and proceeded forthwith to seize the revenues of the See for his own use. A compromise, however, was effected later, and Anselm returned. Finally, the King and the Archbishop came to an agreement. "The King," writes Eadmer, "agreed and enacted that from henceforth no one should be invested in England in a bishopric or abbey by the giving of a pastoral staff or a ring by the King or any lay hand, and Anselm agreed that no person elected to a prelacy should be debarred from consecration on account of the homage which he should do the King." The substantial victory was undoubtedly on the side of the King, as he could exercise the power of veto over the appointment of any one he disliked.

Between the encroachments of the Papacy and the aggressions of the Crown, the Church of England in the Middle Ages suffered many things. It was a case of being ground between

the upper and nether millstones. Yet there were many protests, the earliest of which is recorded in Magna Charta.

"The Church of England shall be free," such are the opening words of "Magna Charta," that palladium of English liberties, ecclesiastical and civil. This recognition of the liberty of the national Church, wrung from King John at Runnymede, bears witness to the deep-seated conviction of the English people—clergy, nobles, and commons—that no unauthorized interference in ecclesiastical matters on the part of popes or sovereigns would be tolerated. There were times when both kings and popes trampled these rights under foot, but it was in the face of a solemn protest once made and never recalled.

It is significant, in the light of recent Roman claims, that the Church of England is here spoken of as a national Church. Clearly, it was not then regarded as a mere off-shoot of the Church of Rome. While, indeed, it was part of a larger whole, the Church of England was conscious of a separate life. It was then, as it

has never ceased to be, an autonomous, national Church. Popes and kings might despoil it and threaten its integrity, but the protest made at Runnymede could not be wholly set aside.

The king often appropriated to himself the revenues of the Church, in flagrant violation of law and justice. William Rufus was the great offender in this respect. When a wealthy and important See fell vacant, the King would often leave it unfilled for several years. In the meanwhile, he seized the revenues and used them for his own purposes. Thus he left the great See of Canterbury vacant for four years, and then made the appointment only because he had a sudden fit of illness and thought he was going to die.

The Pope was not a much better master than the king; indeed, in some respects he was worse. If the king was greedy, much more was the Pope. The king was at least a native of the country, and shared, in some measure, the popular affection for the Church; the Pope was a foreigner, and had no sympathy with English customs and prejudices.

Gradually, the power and authority of the Pope increased in England, and he acquired the privilege of appointing to benefices. This custom had grown out of the system of sending the Pall to the Archbishop of Canterbury on his consecration. The Pall was the symbol of authority, and was given by the Pope in early days as a token of acknowledgment. Afterward, it was the symbol of confirmation, and under later popes was used as a powerful weapon, to dictate the appointment of men favorable to the papal claims.

If it were so with the chief ecclesiastical office in England, the minor ones could not hope to escape. Italians were placed in the most prominent positions. Many of these foreigners never came to England, and those that did come were incapable of performing the duties of their offices from their ignorance of the language. Thousands of pounds were yearly withdrawn from the country, for which no equivalent was ever rendered. It is said that the papal court drew from England in the middle of the thirteenth century sixty or seventy

thousand marks a year, a sum far in excess of the royal revenue. Foreign ecclesiastics fattened upon the revenues of benefices, the very names of which they hardly knew.

In the reign of Henry III., Archbishop Edmund, with the Bishops of Lincoln and Salisbury, received the Pope's command to provide for three hundred Romans out of the first benefices which should fall vacant, and they were to regard themselves as suspended from all right of institution until that number was completely provided for. Pope Martin V. actually undertook to provide for no less than thirteen Sees in the province of Canterbury, and Pope Eugenius even ventured to bestow on the Archbishop of Tours the English Bishopric of Ely. One Italian, it is said, held seven hundred benefices. No wonder that the English people, clergy and laity, rebelled against these flagrant usurpations of their rights, and finally threw off altogether the yoke of Papal Supremacy.

For many years England had been "the milch cow" of the Papacy, but Rome by her injustice

and greed finally overreached herself, and England at the Reformation became lost to her forever. It was then that the theory of the Royal Supremacy, which had never been entirely set aside, was reaffirmed and reinforced. Royal Supremacy differed from Papal Supremacy, in that it made no claim to speak finally and authoritatively in matters of faith. Of course, sovereigns have from time to time endeavored to foist upon the Church their own particular views upon ecclesiastical matters; but the Church has ever resisted this claim, while allowing to the Crown supremacy over matters purely temporal, and the discharge of legal functions which did not involve matters of faith.

The Church, at the Reformation, recognized the Sovereign as Supreme Head; but introduced the qualifying clause, "As far as the law of Christ permits." Henry VIII. disallowed this clause, and assumed the title of "Supreme Head of the Church," without any qualification. He did this, however, in opposition to the protest of Convocation. Elizabeth re-

pudiated this title for herself, fearing that it would be taken to imply too much. She substituted the phrase, "Supreme Governor." The title "Supreme Head" belonged, she affirmed, only to Christ. The phrase which now expresses the Royal Supremacy is "Supreme Governor in these his realms over all persons and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal."

The XXXVII. Article of Religion gives the limits of the jurisdiction of the Crown. The language is as follows:

"We give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments, but that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures by God himself; that is, that they should rule all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil-doers." This is substantially the status of the Church of England to-day.

LECTURE III.

THE REFORMATION—ITS CAUSES AND RESULTS

The Reformation is so vast a subject and presents so many ramifications, that an attempt to treat it in one lecture seems like the height of absurdity. Yet, precisely because of its largeness in the causes which led up to it, the immediate consequences which it involved, and the permanent results which it has entailed upon Western civilization, history, and character, it is perhaps less difficult briefly to sketch its chief features. In representing upon the canvas a broad and extensive landscape as viewed from a distant point of observation, it is possible for the artist to paint with a coarser brush than he could use in depicting a scene less extensive. What he wants is to give the general effect, and he need trouble himself little with details. A few strokes of the brush will often serve to indicate the idea he seeks

to convey. Indeed, if he crowd his canvas with details he is apt to defeat his purpose, for the eye is unable to take them in, and a blurred impression is the result.

An attempt will be made in this lecture to present the Reformation in its large aspect, to indicate the chief causes which produced it, and some of the great results which it effected. As it is the Reformation in England with which we are concerned, the continental movement which preceded and accompanied it will be touched upon only so far as necessary to an understanding of our special subject.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of this great movement. It is safe to say that it dwarfs every other event in the history of Western civilization. Not only did the Reformation alter the religious status of European nations as such, but it effected a profound and radical change in the character and modes of thought of the individual. It divides with a sharp line mediæval from modern times. It ushered in the dawn of a new era, and created a wholly new type of character.

In a movement so complex, involving changes so radical, it is an exceedingly difficult thing to estimate justly the good and the evil results that it effected. Partisans on both sides are apt to hold exaggerated views, and for purposes of controversy take certain short and easy methods of silencing an adversary. Of course, it simplifies matters greatly to declare, on the one side, that the English Church had her origin at the time of Henry VIII., who threw over the authority of the Pope, because he wished to divorce Katherine and marry Anne Boleyn; and, on the other side, to say that the Pope is Anti-Christ and Rome the Apostate Church of the Apocalypse, drunk with the blood of the Saints. But in pursuing an historical inquiry, such short and easy methods are not conducive to an impartial view of the case. An opponent may be silenced by such a method, but never convinced. Let us begin, then, by acknowledging that Henry VIII. was not a model man in either his private or his public life; and that the Pope does not represent the Man of Sin, or

Rome the Babylonish Woman. Let us frankly admit that there were faults on both sides, and that if the Reformation worked much good, it also caused no small amount of evil, evil from which Christendom is suffering deeply to-day.

Chief among these evils must be placed the loss of organic unity among the Churches of Western Christendom. The great schism which in the sixteenth century rent asunder the Body that had preserved its oneness for fifteen hundred years, was certainly the most severe blow that has ever befallen the Church of Christ. We have become so accustomed to the state of things which followed in the train of this schism, that we often fail to appreciate the greatness of the calamity. Up to the time of the Reformation, men might speak of the Church of England, the Church of Spain, the Church of France, or the Church of Italy; but they knew the Church to be everywhere essentially and organically one. Western Christendom then presented an unbroken front to the world. Then, there was outwardly, as

there has never ceased to be inwardly, One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Since the Reformation the Church, rent asunder by schisms and distracted by heresies, has been sore let and hindered in fulfilling her mission to the world.

The divided state of Christendom, and the wide divergence in doctrine and practice among those who claim to follow one Lord and Master, has put a strong weapon into the hands of infidel controversialists, and has robbed Christian apologists of one of the chief arguments for the truth of the Faith. The Fathers of the early Church were wont to point to the substantial agreement among the various churches throughout the world, as conclusive evidence of the presence of the Spirit of Truth and Unity in the Christian household. We believe the same Spirit to be still energizing in the Church, but His outward manifestation is now less apparent. Faith is made more difficult, and the sneer of the unbeliever harder to bear. Christian missions in heathen lands are weighted with difficulties almost insuperable;

amid the babel of sects engaged in unfriendly rivalry, an intelligent heathen hardly knows in what direction to turn.

Among other outgrowths of this loss of visible unity may be mentioned the tendency toward the multiplication of parties and factions, which deem themselves justified in splitting off from the parent body on the slightest provocation. It is stated that there are over three hundred sects, or religious bodies, each one of which claims to represent the true and apostolic type of religion. Then we might further place in the catalogue of evils the many religious wars, the persecutions carried on by all parties, Anglican, Protestant, and Roman; the growth of mental habits leading toward indifference and infidelity; and the cultivation of a spirit of rank individualism and self-complacency.

One of the chief losses to the English Church at the Reformation was the power to enforce proper discipline. The close alliance of the Church with the State and the influence of the secular authority upon ecclesiastical matters

have resulted in an almost total suspension of that godly and apostolic discipline, so necessary to the fulfilment of the functions of a Church whose duty it is to admonish and censure as well as to instruct and nourish.

Over against these evils, which are certainly of a grave and glaring nature, we may place first and foremost the recovery of the Primitive and Apostolic Faith from the overgrowth of mediæval and popular errors and superstitions which surrounded and obscured it. It is no part of our plan to throw stones at the Papacy, or to denounce the Church of Rome for her lapse from what we believe to be the apostolic type of doctrine and practice. Our own branch of the Church is not so free from all abuses that we can without hypocrisy assume the attitude of a stern and uncompromising judge of others. But the faults of the Anglican Communion are mainly those relating to discipline, and it is certainly not too much to say that failings in this direction are not of so grave a nature as those which strike at the very fundamentals of the faith.

The charge which we are forced to bring against the Church of Rome is simply this, that she has *added* to the Faith. No carefully constructed theory of the development of doctrine can gloss over this plain fact. Whatever be the sins of the Anglican Church and her departure from ancient discipline and practice, she at least has not stereotyped her errors. She is still able to confess them, and bring herself into line with whatever is scriptural and apostolic. She has not pledged herself to any theory of infallibility which is contrary alike to Scripture and to the facts of history. Above all, she is not afraid of the light, nor does she seek to restrain her children from a full and candid study of the grounds of her faith and practice.

By her protest against the Dogma of Infallibility, the Anglican Church vindicates the true Headship of Christ over His Church, and she permits no created being to share in the worship due to God alone. However the practice of the Adoration of the Blessed Virgin and the Invocation of the Saints may be explained by the accredited theologians of the Roman

Church, it is certain that the mass of the people does not practically discriminate between the lawful and proper veneration due to the Saints and the worship which should be given to God only. There is an old Latin ecclesiastical saying, "You get the most impressive indication of what the Church believes by looking at the expressions she addresses to Almighty God." Thus, to understand what saint-worship means in the Church of Rome, it is not enough to consider the Articles in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which say that Saints are to be honored and venerated; but we must study the practical system in vogue among the people, and note the language which is used in addressing the Saints. There are undoubtedly many saintly and learned persons in the fold of the Roman Church who cannot but deprecate such a tendency in her practice, but the authority of the Church as a whole is certainly favorable to the system.

With all the evils which the Reformation brought in its train, and they are neither few nor insignificant, we may certainly be thankful

for it, as a whole, and rest assured that the good far outweighs the evil. By means of it the Catholic and Apostolic Faith, the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints, was rescued for us from the mass of error and superstition which had overlain it for centuries. By it men attained to a deeper consciousness of personal responsibility, and the moral progress and spiritual development of mankind were assured.

But we must not assume that when the Reformation was begun in England there was any thought of doctrinal reform. Far from it. There *was* a reform in doctrine, but it came later. Henry VIII., in doctrine and practice, was as stout a defender of the then existing order as it was possible to find. We cannot credit Henry with any high moral purpose in his revolt against Rome. He repudiated nothing that a Romanist believes and accepts today, saving only the Dogma of Infallibility, which had not then been invented. Indeed, early in life, before the contest with the Pope began, he wrote a theological treatise " In Ref-

utation of Martin Luther, Heresiarch," and for this orthodox and pious action received from Pope Leo X. the title of "Defender of the Faith." Henry also left at his death a sum of money to be expended in saying masses for the repose of his soul.

The revolt against the Pope, which Henry initiated, was the result of causes other than doctrinal. The proximate and immediate occasion of the change was the controversy over Henry's divorce, but the causes which prepared the mind of the clergy and the people for this momentous step had their root and origin rather in the practical abuses which stained the Papacy at that time. The state of things had indeed reached such a pass that the Reformation in England was a foregone conclusion. If the matter had not reached a climax in the divorce controversy, some other occasion would undoubtedly have been found.

That a reformation of the Church at that time was necessary, no one who is acquainted with the state of affairs will question. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, things

had been going from bad to worse. The moral corruption during this period is something almost incredible. The need of reform forced itself upon the minds of all good men. Efforts were repeatedly made, by means of councils, to reform the Church from within, but they came to nothing. There was an almost total divorce between religion and morals, and the Vatican authorities were the chief offenders. The wickedness of some of the popes is beyond description. Many of them lived lives of the most shameless debauchery. Simony was rife, and the exactions and extortions of the Papal Court for the purpose of obtaining funds to provide for papal extravagance constituted an intolerable burden upon the clergy and the people. From 1464 to 1503, the Christian world endured the rule of such popes as Paul II., Sixtus IV., Innocent VII., and Alexander VI., each one of whom seems to have striven to exceed the vices of his predecessors.

The Church cried out over this state of wickedness and corruption. A Dominican preacher, about 1484, said, "The world cries

for a Council, but how can it be obtained in the present state of the heads of the Church? No human power avails any longer to reform the Church through a Council, and God Himself must come to our aid in some way unknown to us."

That which the authoritative representatives and accredited leaders of the Church were unable to accomplish, was effected by a humble Augustinian friar known to history as Martin Luther. The mine of papal iniquity and aggression was charged to the full; Luther applied the match, and an explosion followed that shook all Europe, and whose reverberations have echoed down the centuries even to our own time.

It is no part of our plan to consider the wisdom of Luther's method, or to inquire whether the movement which he set on foot might not have been conducted without separation from the Church. Certainly, at first Luther had no intention of creating a schism. He aimed to reform certain corrupt practices, and had no thought of any change in doctrine. But he

was carried on by the force of events further than he had had any thought of going. It was only the hopeless blundering and stupidity of the Roman authorities which converted a necessary reformer of abuses like Luther into an open and defiant foe of the entire Roman system. A little wisdom and patience on their part might have prevented the schism. The Church might have been reformed from within, and an open breach averted. That this is the true view of the case is evident from the action of the Council of Trent thirty years later, when the worst of the abuses against which Luther fulminated were corrected. Even without Luther, it is certain that a reformation would have taken place. The time was ripe for it, the minds of men were prepared for it, and it had to be.

The prevailing ignorance and superstition of the Middle Ages were fast yielding to the light which the introduction of the New Learning was shedding over the minds of men. The revival of classical studies, which was brought about through the presence and influence in Europe

of Greek scholars, compelled to leave Constantinople and other centres of learning in the East after the capture by the Turks in 1453, opened up a long-forgotten field of study. It was the beginning of that period which we know as the Renaissance. Italy was the chief seat of the revival of learning, but its influence was felt far and wide. The old scholastic philosophy, which had long retained its hold over the minds of men, began to be discarded. Things which men had up to this period never questioned, but had received solely on authority, now began to be investigated. The claims of religion and the Church came under scrutiny. Men demanded more than the Church's *ipse dixit*. They sought for the rational grounds of their religion, as set forth in Holy Scripture and in the writings of the early Fathers. The individual became conscious of his personality, and of his accountability to God.

The claims of the Papacy to universal supremacy were seen to rest upon a series of assumptions which had no foundation in Scripture or early history. Investigation and study

proved, morever, that these claims had been bolstered up by a system of misrepresentation and fraudulent documents such as the Forged Decretals. These facts, taken in connection with the practical abuses of the day, prepared men's minds for the mighty change which was coming, and made the Reformation inevitable.

England had long groaned under the system of papal aggression and extortion. The evils and abuses of the monastic system began to be recognized. The monasteries had undoubtedly done an important and much-needed work during the Middle Ages, but it was felt that the time of their usefulness had now passed. They had become blotches upon the body politic, and their utter extermination seemed desirable.

The New Learning soon found its way into England and made rapid progress. As a result, many schools and colleges were founded, and a general revival of learning followed. The art of printing which had been invented in 1450, placed books in the hands of all who desired them, and thus greatly facilitated the

spread of new ideas. Many Englishmen went abroad to study, and thus became inoculated with the spirit of reform prevailing on the Continent. Foreign scholars, like Erasmus, came to England and taught in the universities, which were filled with an eager crowd of students greedy of knowledge.

Another thing which contributed greatly to the overthrow of papal authority in England was the rise of national feeling. There is abundant evidence to prove that England never acquiesced tamely in papal rule. Parliament, since the days of William the Conqueror, had from time to time enacted laws tending to curb the power of the Pope. In 1350, the Statute of Provisors put an end to the Pope's infringement of the rights of patrons; in 1353, appeals to Rome were forbidden under pain of outlawry; in 1367, the King refused any longer to pay the tribute with which King John had disgraced the Kingdom. The Statute of Præmunire, passed in the reign of Richard II., 1383, forbade the bringing of any papal bulls, processes, or excommunications into the Kingdom without

the King's license, under forfeiture of goods and perpetual imprisonment. Thus it will be seen that protests against papal aggression were not lacking.

The growth of national sentiment against the meddling of the Papacy in English affairs continued, and became more wide-spread as time went on. When the final breach took place under Henry VIII., the King had the support of Parliament and the people in throwing off the yoke of the Pope.

It cannot be too strongly insisted upon that the Reformation in England was not, as upon the Continent, individual; but it was the action of the State, and it proceeded upon lines strictly constitutional.

The people of England felt that they were simply asserting their ancient rights. There was no organic change. There was no founding of a new Church. The Church *in* England had been from earliest times the Church *of* England, and so it continued to be. The mediæval Church is linked to the modern Church by the bands of historical continuity.

The Church of England preserved the essentials of Catholic faith and practice. She held to the Historic Creeds and the decisions of Ecumenical Councils. She retained unbroken the chain of an Apostolic Ministry. She repudiated at the Reformation the theory of Papal Supremacy as contrary to Scripture and the facts of early history, and as incompatible with her many previous protests. She did not anathematize the Church of Rome; neither did she refuse to remain on terms of communion with that body. Members of the Roman Church are admitted to her Communion, and priests of that Church may minister at her altars without undergoing re-ordination.

The guilt of schism, then, rests not upon the Church of England but on the Church of Rome, which refuses to recognize her as a branch of the true Church. Rome arrogates to herself the title of the one true Church, and declares that the Pope is the infallible mouthpiece of the Holy Spirit.

These claims the whole Anglican Commun-

ion and the Eastern Church with its millions of members deny.

The English Church, after the Reformation, gave to her children the inestimable boon of the Bible translated entire into the mother tongue. She re-arranged the public offices of the Church, and expunged the mass of mediæval superstitions which had crept in. She ordered the services to be conducted in a "tongue understanded of the people," and she placed in the hands of her children the Book of Common Prayer as their guide in devotion, in doctrine, and worship, and as the charter of their liberties against individual or partisan vagaries.

It remains now to consider briefly the immediate occasion of the English Reformation, the dispute between the Pope and Henry VIII. over the divorce of Katherine.

Let me say at the outset that I hold no brief for Henry VIII. I believe him to have been, morally, one of the most detestable persons with whom history has to do. He was not, however, the coarse tyrant that he is often painted. Henry had been carefully educated;

he was an excellent musician, and was particularly well read in theology. He was designed, it is said, by his father to fill the See of Canterbury. During the early part of his life, he enjoyed much popularity among his subjects. His disposition was lively, and he had a bluff, easy manner. He was an earnest promoter of the New Learning, and showed much kindness to Erasmus and other foreign scholars who visited England. He possessed, however, an inordinate sense of his own importance, and brooked no interference with his royal prerogative. He was, moreover, selfish to the core, unscrupulous in his dealings with the Church and State, impatient of all restraint, unstable in his affections, and relentless in his enmities. But when we have said all this about him, it is certain that his character will compare favorably with that of many popes who ruled the mediæval Church. It ill becomes Roman controversialists to denounce Henry VIII. for his wickedness, in view of the unspeakable enormities committed by men who have sat upon the papal throne. It is per-

haps unfortunate that the Reformation in England began under such a man as Henry VIII.; his action was undoubtedly dictated by the most unworthy motives; he in no sense represented the principles of reform which animated the minds of the good men of his day; but his personal character has nothing to do with the merit of that movement. Henry was simply an instrument in enabling the English Church and the English people to rid themselves of papal tyranny.

If the Pope had rendered a decision in Henry's favor in the matter of his divorce from Katherine, it is safe to say that, as far as he was personally concerned, there would have been no reform in doctrine and practice in the Church of England. But the Reformation would undoubtedly have taken place; the whole trend of feeling and sentiment in England was in favor of it, and he would have found it difficult to oppose the popular will. It is not possible for one man, even though he be a king, to effect any change in the religious attitude of a whole nation unless there exists a

deep and wide-spread desire for such a change. The ease with which the Reformation was effected is sufficient evidence that such a desire existed. The people of England had chafed a long while under the yoke of papal tyranny, and they availed themselves of the first opportunity to throw it off. We can only regret that the immediate occasion of the revolt was not a more worthy one.

Prince Arthur, the eldest son of Henry VII., was married November 14, 1501, to Katherine, daughter of Ferdinand, King of Aragon. The Prince died in the following April, and Henry VII., unwilling to refund the dower of so rich an heiress, obtained a dispensation from Pope Julius II. permitting her to be married to his second son, Henry. The two parties were accordingly betrothed, but their marriage was postponed until after the death of Henry VII. Soon after the accession of Henry VIII., the nuptials of Katherine and Henry were solemnized, June 3, 1509. One child, Mary, afterward known as Bloody Mary, was the result of this union.

In the year 1527 it was rumored that Henry was dissatisfied with his marriage, and intended to take steps to bring the matter before the Pope and ask for an annulment. Henry claimed to have conscientious scruples over the fact of his marriage, as Katherine was his brother's widow and such a union was regarded as incestuous. It was contrary alike to the Levitical law and to the canons of the Church, and therefore it would seem that it was clearly beyond the power of the Pope to grant the dispensation which permitted Henry to espouse Katherine. We need hardly, however, take the King's conscientious scruples seriously. His conscience does not seem to have troubled him for the eighteen years during which he had lived with Katherine as his wife; neither does that inward monitor seem to have disturbed him during his subsequent career. One is tempted to believe that Henry's conscience, if he really possessed any such thing, had decidedly elastic properties. We are rather inclined to suspect that the real reason for Henry's sudden display of remorse was due to

the fact that he had been smitten with the charms of a younger and more beautiful woman, namely, Anne Boleyn. Other motives, such as the desire for a male heir to the throne, may perhaps have influenced the King.

However that may be, the King appealed to the Pope to declare the marriage void. Then ensued a series of tedious negotiations with the Vatican authorities, complicated by the manœuvres of Cardinal Wolsey on the one side and Katherine's nephew, the Emperor Charles V., on the other side. The Pope, Clement VII., was between two fires. He did not wish to make an open enemy of Charles; neither did he wish to antagonize Henry. He did, therefore, what most people do under like circumstances: he procrastinated. Henry insisted upon a decision. In the meanwhile, Katherine received permission to carry her appeal to Rome.

The case dragged along for several years, and nothing definite was accomplished. Finally the Pope issued a bull March 7, 1530, forbidding Henry to marry a second time until the

first marriage should have been judicially and properly annulled. This obstacle exasperated the King and was the occasion of the disgrace of his favorite Wolsey.

At this point Cranmer, who was destined to play so important a part in the subsequent history of the times, appeared upon the scene. He was at the time a Fellow of the University of Cambridge, and the King's attention was first directed to him by a chance conversation which Cranmer had with two of the King's train regarding the King's divorce, then the absorbing topic of the day. Cranmer expressed himself strongly upon the subject. "All canonists were agreed," he said, "that the Pope could not dispense from God's law; and if the English ecclesiastical courts should decide that Arthur and Katherine were married, then it followed that Henry's marriage was no marriage, and the proper course was not to ask the Pope for a dispensation, but to assume that the marriage was originally null and void and the King a bachelor at liberty to marry without any dispensation."

These remarks of Cranmer's were repeated

to the King, who is said to have replied, in his somewhat coarse way, "This fellow has got the right sow by the ear. Bring him here." Cranmer accordingly entered the King's service. He was commissioned by the King to conduct the negotiations with the Pope, and to obtain the opinion of the foreign universities upon the question at issue. The See of Canterbury falling vacant, the King appointed Cranmer to the place; he was consecrated Archbishop, March 30, 1533.

Meantime, the King got tired of waiting, and acting on Cranmer's view that he was a bachelor, married Anne Boleyn privately, it is said, in January, 1533. In the following May the Archbishop cited Katherine to appear before his court for the trial of the divorce. Katherine refused to acknowledge his jurisdiction; and Cranmer proceeded to pronounce a final decree and sentence, to the effect that the marriage was null and void from the beginning.

This action was of course a bold attack upon the Papal Supremacy, a sharp defiance of the papal pretensions to supreme ultimate jurisdic-

tion. By this decision the Church of England, through its Primate, claimed the right to settle ecclesiastical questions in the national courts. The Pope responded by declaring Cranmer's sentence null and void, on the ground that the case was then pending in the papal court. Finally, on March 24, 1534, the Pope rendered his decision that the marriage of Henry and Katherine was valid, and commanded him to restore her to her rights on pain of excommunication. Of course, Henry refused to obey, and the breach thus created grew wider.

In 1534, England formally repudiated the Papal Supremacy, and four years later the Pope published his sentence of excommunication against Henry.

Only the initial step toward the reformation of the Church took place in Henry's reign. The reformation in doctrine and practice came later, and, though interrupted for a few years during Mary's reign, finally found its full expression in the time of Elizabeth. It was not until then, when all hope of effecting a reconciliation had vanished, that the Pope, Pius V.,

in 1570 launched his great Bull of Excommunication, denouncing Elizabeth, and commanding all her subjects to violate their oaths of allegiance under pain of sharing in the like anathemas.

In that year originated the Anglo-Roman Schism.

LECTURE IV.

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF DISSENT

There is an inevitable tendency in every great popular movement to outrun the original purpose of those by whom it was begun. There are always to be found impatient and unbalanced spirits who are dissatisfied with anything short of the total destruction of the whole system, any part of which seems to them to savor of the ancient *régime* which they have striven to overthrow. Such persons are unable to discriminate between the system itself and the evils which have attached themselves to it. They would condemn the whole system, however much good it may contain, because it also contains some evil. Nothing but a root-and-branch policy of extermination suits such minds.

In no great movement is this truth made more apparent than in the Reformation. The

seeds of anarchy and disorder, which had been widely sown during this period, were not long in bringing forth their unhappy fruit. Men's minds had been so long held in check by the bands of a rigid absolutism that when at last the cords which confined and cramped the human intellect were loosened, a sudden and radical reaction was the result. Man, like a long imprisoned bird, yearned to try his powers and to exercise his newly acquired freedom; and freedom with many soon degenerated into license. Having cast off the trammels of papal authority, many were for repudiating all authority external to themselves. Things which heretofore had been universally regarded as objects of love and reverence began to be despised and hated, from their association with that which was proved false and harmful.

In such a crisis as the Reformation induced, it required rare discrimination to separate the wheat from the tares, and this judicial attitude could be expected only of the few. The many, lacking the quality of discrimination, were only too easily induced to follow the leader-

ship of those who adopted the most extreme, and therefore the simplest, policy.

The Rise and Progress of Dissent serves as an illustration of this tendency of mankind to adopt extreme measures. Undoubtedly there were many evils and abuses existing in the English Church which demanded a remedy; but at the time of the Reformation she corrected the chief abuses, and made an earnest effort to adjust her machinery to the altered condition of affairs. As has been pointed out in a previous lecture, the Reformation in England was conducted in a conservative spirit. There was no sudden and violent departure from ancient customs and traditions; there was no rejection of anything in doctrine and practice that could prove itself to be Catholic and Apostolic.

Of course, it was impossible at once to correct all evils. The Church was slowly but surely feeling her way back to a purer type. It was a period of transition, a time to try men's souls.

There was in the Church a small but deter-

mined party which stoutly resisted all efforts for reform, and strove to restore the Church to the papal obedience. There was also a large and increasing faction which contended that the Reformation had not gone far enough, and which loudly demanded more radical changes. Midway between these two extremes were the moderate churchmen, loyal to both Church and Sovereign, who would listen to no scheme that could bring the English Church again under the papal yoke, but who, on the other hand, would consent to no changes that would place the Church on a level with the bodies founded by the continental reformers.

It was not long before the party looking Romeward separated itself from the Communion of the English Church. Up to the time of the excommunication of Queen Elizabeth by Pope Pius V., in 1570, the members of this party, who recognized the Pope as *de jure* supreme over all Christians, had attended worship in the parish churches and received the Sacrament at the hands of Anglican priests. They had used the Prayer-Book without

scruple. Indeed, there is strong evidence for believing that the Pope agreed to permit the Prayer-Book to be used, if the Queen would consent to own his authority and receive the Book as coming from him. As his advances, however, met with no encouragement, the Pope proceeded to excommunicate the Queen, and to anathematize all who acknowledged her authority. Then it was that those who owned the Pope's authority were forbidden to attend services in the parish churches, and were ordered to form a separate communion. This party was not, however, formally organized into a sect until 1581, when a rival Church was established by foreign members of the Jesuit order. Thus it will be seen that the Anglican claim, that the Roman Communion in England partakes of the character of a sect, is justly made.

This Roman Mission, as it is termed, was for many years presided over by arch-priests and subsequently by four vicars-apostolic or deputy-bishops. This was the method of government until 1688, when Pope Innocent XI.

divided England into four districts. In 1840 these four districts were sub-divided into eight. The deputy-bishops then appointed were consecrated " in partibus infidelium " (in the countries of the heathen). In 1850 Pope Pius IX., " with a view to provide for the prosperity and increase of the Catholic religion in the Kingdom of England," by Letters-Apostolic divided England into thirteen dioceses. The bishops appointed by the Pope were forbidden by English law, however, to assume the ecclesiastical title of any existing See. Thus among the first dissenters from the English Church may be placed the Roman Catholics.

Mention has been made of a large party in the Church which was dissatisfied with the conservative character that the Reformation assumed in England. Some authorities trace the origin of this faction to Wickliffe and his followers, known as the Lollards, who flourished during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Wickliffe himself was a man with the best intentions. He saw and recognized the evils that prevailed in the Church, and lifted up his voice

against them. He was a man, however, fitted rather to pull down than to build up; and he set in motion a movement that soon degenerated into a blind and unreasonable antagonism to both Church and State. Whether it be historically correct or not to say that Puritanism had its origin in this movement, it is at least certain that the wild speculations and disregard for authority in both Church and State, that marked Puritanism, found their seeds in this earlier movement.

The existence in the Church of a party with puritanical tendencies can be traced for many years before the name of Puritan, as designating a particular faction, was known. "The name Puritan," as has been observed, "is a constant source of trouble to the historian." At Rome it means a Protestant. In England, it was first applied to the Calvinists; then it was used to designate a Non-conformist in ceremonial; and lastly, a Dissenter in doctrine. But it was thus used without implying separation from the Church. The appellation was given, it has been supposed, in ridicule to those who clamored

for what they considered to be a purer type of doctrine and practice. This invariably meant a rejection of much that the Church had believed and practised, and the setting up of a wholly new type, or rather caricature, of Christianity.

For some time after the breach with Rome, the members of this party made no attempt to create a formal schism; but they bent all their energies to bring the Church of England into line with the continental sectaries. It looked, at one time, as if the attempt to rob the Church of her Catholic heritage and make of her simply another sect would prove successful. Puritanism, as we shall see, having obtained control of the reins of government, was able for a season to drive out the ancient Faith and substitute in its place the Puritan conception of Christianity. But Puritanism failed to retain its hold upon England. It was, in fact, a system uncongenial to English life and character. Good and patriotic men were alarmed and horrified at the excesses into which the nation was plunged by its leaders. The murder of the

King, and the overthrow of the ancient form of government in Church and State, aroused popular disgust and indignation, and created a strong sentiment in favor of the Restoration. Puritanism was also weakened by internal dissensions. The Presbyterian and Independent wings of the Puritan party hated each other cordially.

Puritanism, though founded ostensibly on "liberty of conscience," was by no means true to its principles. Cromwell himself complained that "each sect lustily cries out for liberty of conscience, and when they have acquired it, will by no means allow it to any but themselves."

"The only ecclesiastical benefit," it has been said, "for which England has to thank the Independents of the Commonwealth is this: that they delivered this country from the imminent danger of a Presbyterian Church Establishment; while, again, the death of Cromwell seems, humanly speaking, alone to have prevented an Independent State Establishment from being set up in its stead."

It is hard, perhaps, for one who has been brought up and trained in the spirit and tradi-

tions of the Anglican Communion, to do justice to the Puritan character. Undoubtedly, the Puritan had his good points; but they are so obscured by his intolerance, fanaticism, lack of reverence, and hatred of all that was venerable in antiquity and beautiful in art that his character, to say the least, does not call forth unstinted admiration. Of course, the Puritan had his virtues, though we cannot help thinking that even these have been exaggerated. It has been claimed for them that they were the first who asserted the right of the individual to "liberty of conscience." It is evident, however, from the facts of history, that "liberty of conscience," in their eyes, meant the right to hold their own opinions, and to impress these opinions upon others whenever they were strong enough to do so.

As a matter of fact, what we understand by "liberty of conscience" is a thing of wholly modern birth. Three hundred years ago it was unknown. As there was one source of authority in civil matters, so also was there one in ecclesiastical matters. A revolt against the

established order in the Church was considered as much of a crime as a revolt against the established order in the State. The State and the Church, while exercising different functions, were yet united by the closest ties. It was regarded as the duty of the civil magistrate to enforce obedience and conformity to ecclesiastical as well as civil laws. Dissent in religion was as severely punished as sedition in politics.

The dominant party in Church and State felt it their duty to impose conformity upon all. The stake and the axe were the arguments freely used by all parties when they obtained the power. Roman Catholics, Puritans, and Anglicans, each in turn, adopted repressive measures when the opportunity presented itself. The Puritans were not a whit behind others in this respect.

Undoubtedly we do owe a measure of gratitude to the Puritans for the advocacy of what is called "civil liberty." They vindicated the right of the individual to equality before the law, and impressed this idea upon English leg-

islation. The Puritan, moreover, in a worldly and licentious age, by the gravity of his demeanor and the strictness of his habits, bore witness to the solemnity of life, and the accountability of the individual to God.

Macaulay has given us a description of the Puritan of those days, which may not be out of place here:

"His gait, his garb, his lank hair, the sour solemnity of his face, the upward whites of his eyes, his nasal twang, his peculiar dialect, his malignant disposition, marked him out from other men. It was a sin to hang garlands on a May-pole, to drink to the health of a friend, to fly a hawk, to play at chess, or to read the 'Faëry Queen.' The weekly festival on which the Church, from its first foundation, had commemorated the Resurrection of Our Lord, was fenced around with more than Pharisaic restrictions of the ancient Sabbath. Some had scruples about teaching boys the rules of Latin grammar, because the names of Mars and Apollo and Bacchus were to be found in the examples. They objected to baiting

bears, not because it gave pain to the bears, but because it afforded pleasure to the spectators."

Of course, such men could have nothing in common with the stately ceremonial and beautiful ritual which were used in the public services of the Church. All was indiscriminately denounced as "dregs of Popery," and "marks of Anti-Christ" and of the "Beast."

Many of these ultra-reformers, who were compelled to flee the country during the reign of Queen Mary, settled in Geneva and other centres of Calvinistic influence. Upon their return on the accession of Elizabeth, they brought with them the Calvinistic ideas regarding doctrine and practice which they had imbibed abroad. Elizabeth proceeded at first very cautiously. She wished to conciliate all parties, and accordingly many men of the Geneva school were appointed to prominent places in the English Church. These restless spirits immediately began to stir up trouble. They objected to everything in the doctrine and practice of the English Church, which was not

in accord with the "pure Gospel" as taught by John Calvin.

In the year 1564, the Puritan party broke out into open revolt against all ecclesiastical order. They objected to the surplice, because it seemed to them to imply sacerdotal pretensions on the part of the clergy; the sign of the cross in baptism or at any other time was denounced; the use of a ring in the marriage ceremony roused their ire as a relic of paganism. To bow at the name of Jesus indicated strong papistic tendencies; they objected to a liturgical form of worship, to all instrumental music, to kneeling at the reception of the Eucharist; altar lights and altar crosses were their particular abhorrence.

Speaking of the spirit which animated the Puritan party in the Church during Elizabeth's reign, the historian Froude says: "Systematic irreverence was intruded into the churches; carelessness and irreligion had formed an unnatural alliance with Puritanism, and in many places the Lord's Table consisted of bare boards resting on trestles in the middle

of the nave. The communicants knelt, stood, or sat as they liked; the chalice was the first cup that came to hand, the clergyman wore surplice, the Geneva black gown, or his ordinary dress, as he pleased."

The Puritan party, in other words, did everything in their power to reduce the public worship of the Church to the dead level of vulgarity and commonplaceness that characterized the "pure religion" of Geneva. Such a course of conduct on the part of ministers, pledged to obedience to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the English Church, could not long be tolerated. Active measures were therefore taken to compel these refractory ministers to conform to the appointed usage. Many of the Puritan clergymen were deprived of their benefices for their refusal to obey the laws; while others evaded the law and sought to relieve the strain upon their consciences by employing others to read the services from the Book of Common Prayer, while they remained in the vestry-room until the time came for the delivery of the sermon.

It has been urged that a compromise might have been made with this party, whereby their conscientious scruples in liturgical and ritual matters might have been considered. But any settlement was manifestly impossible which would not deprive the Church of everything that marked it off as distinct from the Continental sects. What the Puritan party really aimed at, was to introduce into the Church of England the peculiar and heretical tenets of Calvinism. Above all they wished to abolish Episcopacy, and institute a Presbyterian form of polity. They would stop short of nothing save a complete and radical change. The conservative and High Church party in the Church was politely designated as the "spawn of papacy" by the Puritans, and was more cordially hated than even the Roman Catholics. By no stretch of the imagination can those who were ejected from their benefices for their refusal to conform to the established usage of the Church be regarded as martyrs.

It was not long before some of the more headstrong in the Puritan party withdrew from

the Church, and organized a separate body as Presbyterians on Calvinistic lines. This schism took place in 1572, and marks the beginning of sectarian opposition to the Established Church. From that time the spirit of separation from the Church became rife. But the large majority of the Puritan party still remained in the Church and fomented trouble. The Puritan ministers were loath to relinquish their benefices, but eased their consciences by trying to leaven the Church with Calvinistic principles.

When James I. came to the throne, they had great hopes that he would prove favorable to their side. He did call together representatives of the Church and anti-Church parties, to consider the questions at issue, and if possible to provide remedies; but at this meeting, known as the Hampton Court Conference, it was impossible to reach any common ground of agreement. The King declared that most of the Puritan demands were at variance with the acknowledged status of the Church of England. Some slight verbal changes were made in the Prayer-Book, but nothing was accomplished

that could be considered favorable to Puritanism. The Puritan party, however, scored a victory in the appointment of Abbot, Bishop of London, to the See of Canterbury. Abbot was thoroughly in sympathy with the Puritans, and exerted his influence to spread their tenets.

During the reign of King James, the Puritans increased largely in numbers and influence, and the gulf between them and the Established Church grew wider.

It is unnecessary to recount the great struggle that ensued between the Crown and the Parliament in the reign of King Charles. The Puritan party was strong in Parliament and stood up stoutly for the rights of the people. Thus Puritanism became identified with the cause of civil liberty; while the Church party supported the King, and on account of its advocacy of the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings, came into discredit among the people generally.

"The history of the struggle between Charles and his Parliament," it has been said, "is the

history of a religious struggle, ending in the temporary triumph of Puritanism; but in that struggle we find Parliament usurping the duties of the Church and of Convocation, and pronouncing ecclesiastical censures, whilst the Church invaded the duties of Parliament by insisting on the Divine Right of Kings and of its own right to impose taxes without, and even in opposition to, the consent of Parliament." The bloody sequel to this quarrel between King Charles and the Parliament is well known and need not detain us.

The famous Parliament known as the Long Parliament assembled in 1640. The Puritans were strongly in the majority, and proceeded to pass a seriesof acts aimed at the integrity of the Church. Clergymen, whose sole offence consisted of bowing at the name of Jesus, were condemned as "scandalous and malignant," and deprived of their benefices. Commissioners were appointed by the House of Commons for the visitation of churches. "They were to demolish and remove out of churches and chapels all images, altars, or tables turned al-

tar-wise, crucifixes, superstitious pictures, and other monuments and relics of idolatry." Thus was set on foot that movement of destruction and vandalism that lasted until the Restoration, the results of which are even yet obvious to those who visit the English cathedrals.

From 1640 to the execution of the King, in 1649, the Puritan party carried things with a high hand. Archbishop Laud was accused of various crimes and misdemeanors, the chief being that he endeavored to introduce Popery, and had abused his position to discriminate against Puritans in the matter of appointing to ecclesiastical benefices. He was executed as a public enemy, in 1645. His real offence undoubtedly was that he stoutly opposed the spoliation of the Church, and the efforts of the Puritan party to drag it down to the level of a sect.

The abolition of Episcopacy in Scotland in 1641 excited the hopes of the Puritan party that the King would sanction a like movement in England, but this the King refused to do. Charles stated his belief that Episcopacy was the form of government most agreeable to the

Word of God, and asserted that he stood ready to seal his belief with his blood.

The relations of the King with the House of Commons grew more and more strained. The bishops were deprived of their position in the House of Lords, and soon afterward Parliament passed a law known as the "Root and Branch Bill," by which Episcopacy was abolished in England. Following this came a general ejectment of Church of England clergy, and the appointment of Puritan ministers to the places thus made vacant.

In 1645, Parliament passed an ordinance providing for "an assembly of learned and godly divines, and others to be consulted with by Parliament for the settling of the government and liturgy of the Church of England, and for vindicating and clearing the doctrine of the said Church from false aspersions and interpretations." This body was known as the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Acting with the House of Commons, the Assembly signed the Solemn League and Covenant which had been formulated in Scotland, whereby the

signers pledged themselves "to resist Prelacy in England and Ireland, that is, Church Government by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other ecclesiastical offices depending on that Hierarchy." Every person of the age of eighteen was ordered to sign the Covenant. The Prayer-Book was abolished, and a Directory for public worship, modelled on Puritan lines, was issued. The use of the Prayer-Book, both in public and private, was prohibited under penalty of fine and imprisonment. The clergy who refused to accept and use the Directory were deprived of their livings. The Westminster Assembly also set forth a Longer and a Shorter Catechism, and a Confession of Faith to take the place of the Thirty-nine Articles.

On January 30, 1649, the King was executed. Thus the triumph of the Puritans was complete; having abolished the Church of England, they next destroyed the Throne.

The two wings of Puritanism, Presbyterian and Independent, had struggled some years for the supremacy, but Independency finally

triumphed. From the destruction of the Monarchy until the Restoration, the Independents with the Baptists, the Quakers, and other minor sects, which cared nothing for the Presbyterian system of discipline, sowed dissensions in the Puritan body, and at last obtained control of affairs. Government by presbyters was as obnoxious to these sectaries as government by bishops. Presbyter was discovered to be merely "priest writ large." The Westminster Assembly came to an end, and by the time of the Restoration the Presbyterian wing of the Puritan party had been shorn of its power and influence.

After the death of Cromwell, in 1688, there was a period of anarchy and disorder, which culminated two years later in the restoration of both King and Church. Puritanism had proved itself a harsh master; it had been weighed in the balance and found wanting, and there was a deep and widespread desire for a return to the old order. The few bishops and clergy who had survived the Rebellion were reinstated, and the Prayer-Book and

the services of the Church came again into use.

In 1662, the Prayer-Book underwent revision; but no important changes, from a doctrinal point of view, were made. An Act of Uniformity was passed, by which every occupant of a benefice was required to declare his assent to everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, to repudiate the Solemn League and Covenant, and to receive Episcopal ordination. Some eight hundred Puritan ministers refused to comply with these provisions, and were accordingly ejected from the benefices to which they had in the first place been illegally appointed. Undoubtedly, the ejectment of these ministers was the cause of much suffering and distress, and they have been extolled as martyrs by ultra-Protestant writers. It must be borne in mind, however, that these men were occupying the livings of the English Church clergy, who had been turned out in great numbers when the Puritans were in power. Moreover, these Puritan ministers could have no rightful place in the reor-

ganized Church of England so long as they refused to obey her laws. From this time the Puritan party, as such, ceased to exist; and out of its ranks rose the various sects and nonconformist bodies, which are known generally as Dissenters.

Little space remains in which to treat of the origin and growth of the various sectarian bodies. It was thought best to concentrate attention upon Puritanism, because it is from Puritanism that they have mostly sprung. Puritanism was the fruitful parent of most of the forms of dissent in England and America.

It is the invariable tendency of Schism and Dissent to multiply their kind. There are now reckoned, I believe, some three hundred various religious bodies whose origin can be traced to the English Church.

Historically considered, the oldest of these sects is the Presbyterian. This body, holding originally to the doctrine, practice, and form of government known as Calvinism, split up, as time went on, into various schools and factions. A large proportion of the English Presbyte-

rians drifted into Socinianism or other forms of unbelief. Many joined the Independents. In Scotland, Presbyterianism has held its own, though even there several divisions have taken place.

The Independents were, like the Presbyterians, a product of Puritanism. They seceded from the Church on the principles of Independency. Unlike the Presbyterians, who held to the principle of divine order in the ministry, and lodged authority in the Presbytery instead of the Episcopate, the Independents claimed that each congregation had the right of government within itself. According to their view, each congregation is wholly independent of every other. Various congregations may unite for any common purpose, but there is no organic and vital connection between them. Each congregation has the power to determine its own faith, doctrine, and practice, to elect and depose its pastors and church officers, and to exercise discipline over its members.

This sect had its rise in 1569, and its founder

was one Robert Browne, a priest of the English Church and chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk. The name of Brownists was first given to his followers, who subsequently assumed the title of Independents, afterward changed to Congregationalists. Browne, after fomenting much trouble and paving the way for the disasters that befell the country in the seventeenth century, repudiated his connection with the sect he had founded, and was finally reconciled to the Church.

The Baptists in England appear for the first time as a separate body in the reign of Charles I. They were an offshoot of the Brownists or Independents, and have no historical connection with the Anabaptists of Germany, Switzerland, and Holland. The first foundation of a separate communion dates from the year 1633. A congregation of Independents in London, holding that the body to which they belonged was not sufficiently strict in discipline and practice, and also that baptism should be administered only to adults, formed a separate denomination on that basis. A stricter

maintenance of Calvinistic doctrines was also one of the objects of the new sect. Several other congregations were formed in London and elsewhere, and the body increased rapidly in numbers, and during the great Rebellion attained to considerable political influence. This sect also has divided and subdivided many times.

Of all the bodies which have at various times gone out from the English Church, there is none whose exodus is so much to be regretted as that of the Methodists. Methodism, unlike the other systems which we have been considering, cannot be regarded as the product of Puritanism. It was a movement from within the Church, and there was not at first any intention of withdrawing from her Communion and forming a new sect.

The movement in which Methodism took its rise was undoubtedly called for. During the eighteenth century spiritual life in the Church of England was beyond question at a very low ebb. Infidelity and indifference were prominent in high places. The religious conscious-

ness of the people needed to be awakened, the bishops and clergy needed a spur to arouse them to a proper sense of their duties. It was an age of skepticism among the educated classes, and of dense ignorance among the lower. Many of the bishops and clergy lived lives hardly distinguishable from those of the wealthy and pleasure-loving laity by whom they were surrounded. A revival of religion was sorely needed, and it came through the efforts of John Wesley, a priest of the English Church.

The new movement had its origin at Oxford, where Charles Wesley, a brother of John Wesley, gathered a little band of undergraduates about him, who bound themselves to observe certain rules or *methods* in the matter of reading the Bible, prayer, and visiting the poor. Hence the name of Methodists was given to them. John Wesley subsequently joined the company; and by his earnestness, zeal, and skill in organization, largely increased the influence and numbers of the body. The first Methodists were entirely loyal to the

Church of their birth. They lived under a strict rule, fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays, and receiving the Holy Communion weekly.

Some of the methods which Wesley used were opposed to the formal spirit of the English Church at that time. It must be admitted that he and his followers did not always receive just and courteous treatment at the hands of the bishops and other dignitaries. He sought to do a work among the poor and ignorant which they ought to have done, and his success was little short of marvellous. Being refused permission to use the parish churches for their preaching services, the Methodists erected a number of preaching houses which soon developed into chapels. Laymen were allowed by Wesley to preach, and to use the Prayer-Book. The Countess of Huntington, a wealthy and influential woman, became deeply interested in the movement and erected many chapels.

In doctrine, Wesley claimed to be a High Churchman. He hated Calvinism, and de-

clared that he would rather be a Turk, a Deist, or an Atheist, than a Calvinist.

The Wesleyans increased rapidly, but there was no open break with the English Church until 1784, when Wesley, then over eighty years old, allowed his better judgment to be overruled, and committed a direct act of schism by attempting to confer Holy Orders upon others. Charles Wesley refused to follow his brother in this unlawful action, and is said to have written the following caustic epigram:

> "How easy now are bishops made
> By man or woman's whim,
> Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,
> But who laid hands on him?"

That John Wesley afterward deeply regretted this schismatical action, is highly probable. In a sermon preached in 1789, two years before his death, he said, "I hold all the doctrines of the Church of England; I love her liturgy; I approve her plan of discipline. I dare not separate from the Church; that, I

believe, it would be a sin to do." A year before his death, he wrote, "I live and die a member of the Church of England, and no one who regards my judgment will ever separate from it.

That his followers did not regard this solemn admonition but separated from the Church in great numbers and set up a schismatical body, side by side with the Church to which their founder belonged, simply shows the disastrous consequences which often flow from one ill-advised action.

After Wesley's death, the Methodists split up into a number of factions; and have increased and multiplied, particularly in our own country.

One cannot help thinking that the movement begun by Wesley might have been directed into more conservative channels, and another schism thus averted. Certainly, the English Church was justly chargeable at that time with indifference and formalism, and with failure to appreciate the necessity for the revival of spiritual life which Wesley began.

Had the Church of England been then what it is to-day, it is safe to say that this schism would not have taken place.

In all that has been said upon the subject of Dissent, it is not meant to imply that the Church of England is free from blame. She has many grave sins to answer for, and ought not to deal in any harsh and censorious spirit with those who have gone out from her Communion. Rather should she look upon such as belonging to her by right, her erring children, but still her children.

LECTURE V.

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC REVIVAL

By the Anglo-Catholic Revival is meant that renaissance of church-life which began at Oxford in the third decade of the present century, and which was ushered in by what is known to history as the Oxford or Tractarian movement. This movement, starting in a humble and unostentatious manner, and carried on mainly through the medium of tracts, had for its original object the arousing of the minds of Churchmen to the dangers that threatened the integrity of the Church.

The assaults aimed at the Church came from two quarters. There was a radical spirit abroad in politics, which sought to humble and degrade the Church in the interest of Dissent and Nonconformity; and there was also a latitudinarian spirit in theology, which strove from within to break down the orthodox faith.

The Church, at the period of which we are speaking, was largely regarded as a mere establishment, an appendage of the State, and therefore something which an act of Parliament could unmake. The Latitudinarian or Broad Church party was strongly in sympathy with the radical element in politics, and clamored for a wider and more liberal interpretation of the Church's formularies. One and the same spirit of destruction animated both parties, in Church and State, and they thus reacted upon each other.

The Oxford movement was designed to arouse the friends of the Church to the grave perils which threatened her life as a corporate body, united to, yet distinct from, the State; and also to protest against the dangerous laxity in doctrine and practice which largely prevailed. The form which the movement assumed was what might be called a "campaign of education." The true position and claims of the Church had become obscured. The fact of the Establishment had dulled in many minds a sense of the Church's independence as a Spirit-

ual Society. Her outward dress and her apparent reliance upon an arm of flesh tended to deprive her, in men's minds, of her divine character and her Catholic mission. In the thoughts of very many people the Church of England was like the army or navy, a department of the State, and therefore justly subject to the State. In view of the popular feeling toward the Church, therefore, it was of prime necessity that her true position should be vindicated. The claims of the Church to be a true branch of the Society which was founded by Christ, and therefore to occupy a position wholly and entirely different from the sects about her, needed to be pressed home upon the minds of Churchmen. It was necessary to create a sentiment of loyalty to the Church in the breasts of the people, and this could be done only by making them acquainted with her history. Men had to be brought to see that the Church was their spiritual Mother, and that as her faithful children it was their bounden duty to defend her against the assaults of political foes without and the machinations of disloyal sons within.

That the Oxford movement has succeeded in accomplishing the objects which called it into being, no one can doubt, for the signs and tokens of renewed life and revivified energies are visible throughout the whole Anglican Communion. We are, in our own land and day, enjoying the benefits of that renaissance of Catholic life which began some sixty years ago at Oxford. We are now breathing its subtle influence. It has brought to us as Churchmen the consciousness of a larger life. It has taught us to prize our birthright as living members of that Catholic and Apostolic Society which, like its Divine Founder and Head, is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. It has deepened the sense of our responsibilities, while it has at the same time added a fresh stimulus to our activities. It has aroused in us a proper pride in the history and traditions of that branch of the Church Catholic whose spirit and institutions we have inherited. We know ourselves to be parts of a greater whole. Although few in numbers in this country, we are conscious of a larger fellowship;

and this fact has increased our self-respect, and inspired us to labor more earnestly and hopefully in the cause of Christian Unity.

We feel that the Body to which we belong, inasmuch as it represents the true branch of the Apostolic Church to the Anglo-Saxon peoples, has the strongest possible claim upon the allegiance of the vast majority of our fellow countrymen. To everyone in whose veins runs the blood of a common English ancestry, we may say without arrogance: "You belong to us. Our Church is your Church. Your forefathers belonged to it and loved it. It is your privilege, nay, it is your duty, to identify yourself with it."

The state of the English Church a hundred years ago cannot be described as other than deplorable. It is not meant to imply that the morals of the people were worse than at other periods in history, though undoubtedly they were extremely lax; but spiritual life generally was at a low ebb. There was a conspicuous lack of enthusiasm. The Methodist movement, begun within the Church, had spent its force,

and had taken a form that placed it beyond the sympathy of loyal English Churchmen.

The High Church party of the period was of the high and dry stamp. A majority of the members of this party was tainted with Erastian ideas. The Church as an establishment overshadowed, in their minds, the Church as a spiritual society, having a peculiar and independent life of its own. They held strongly to the teachings of the Prayer-Book, and believed firmly in the necessity of the Sacraments. They had a deep dislike of Dissent, and deprecated enthusiasm. Dr. Manners Sutton, who became Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1805, is said to have offered the following advice to the newly consecrated Bishop of Calcutta: "Remember, my Lord Bishop, that your Primate on the day of your consecration defined your duty to you; that duty is *to put down enthusiasm* and to preach the Gospel." Bishop Lavington wrote a book for the special purpose of holding up to scorn the enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists.

The High Church clergyman of the period

was often a well-educated and accomplished gentleman. He lived on terms of easy intimacy with the gentry of the neighborhood. He was a welcome guest at their tables, and his home life was often a model of what a Christian gentleman's should be. But he took his obligations easily. He was content if he performed the canonical duties of his office, and had no idea of assuming any extra obligations. He lived his life, and did what he considered his duty, in a quiet, unostentatious manner. His preaching was marked by a scholarly and even an academic tone. There was nothing to arouse the emotions or disturb the tranquillity of his hearers. The idea of the priesthood was not wholly lost sight of, but it was merged largely in the parish parson, the Church and State clergyman. As such, the incumbent of a country living was, excepting perhaps the Lord of the Manor, the most important personage in the community. He often acted as umpire in local quarrels, and was the trusted adviser of his parishioners in their various difficulties and distresses. He

was, in short, a kindly English country gentleman in clerical attire, who felt himself to have a special mission to regulate the morals of the community.

Of course, there were also other types, such as the fox-hunting and sporting parson, and the hunter after preferment, who had little or no conception of the dignity and duties pertaining to their calling. But this class was never very numerous, at least not so numerous as is popularly supposed.

Besides the High Church party, which we may call the Orthodox party and which comprised the majority of the clergy, there was the Evangelical school. Individuals of this school had done much to awaken the national conscience on the subject of the slave-trade and other abuses. They had organized the Church Missionary Society for the purpose of spreading their peculiar views in the foreign field, in opposition to the older and more orthodox body, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The Religious Tract Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society were

also the creations of this school. Undoubtedly, much necessary and valuable work was done by its members; but this party was not working on Church lines. The members affiliated and associated with Dissenters, in fact, they saw but little difference between the Church of England and other religious bodies. Many of the Clergy of this school passed into the ranks of Dissent, and took up a position of antagonism to the national Church. Let us give them their just due. Many of them lived lives of the most exemplary piety. They were faithful pastors and zealous in good works. If their mental horizon was somewhat limited and their sympathies were somewhat narrow, they at least represented at that period about all there was in the English Church of enthusiasm and self-devotion. The great fault with them was that they were not loyal to the Church to which they belonged. They continually sought to compromise her doctrine and practice. They professed an attachment to the Prayer-Book, but their teaching was not the teaching of the Prayer-Book. They laid great stress upon the

matter of individual conversion. The doctrines of Election and Personal Assurance of Salvation were the themes upon which they most frequently dilated. When the teaching of the Church upon any point, such as the nature and efficacy of the Sacraments, was opposed to the views which they held, they were free to denounce it as Popish. They exalted the preaching office at the expense of the Church service, whereas we to-day recognize that, although preaching has a distinct and important place in the Church, that position is a secondary one.

The idea of worship as a great duty of the Christian was at this period largely obscured. The services were unattractive, and therefore poorly attended. The service was often a duet between the clergyman and the parish clerk. There were no hymns, as we understand them. There was a versified edition of the Psalter, but it was a somewhat dreary and uninspiring collection. The sermon was often unconscionably long, and it was apt to have a somniferous effect upon the congregation. The

churches were opened on Sunday and closed all the rest of the week. Holy days were irregularly observed, and the Holy Communion, in most cases, was administered not oftener than once a month, frequently not oftener than once in three months. The church buildings were in a sad state, out of repair and destitute of ornament. The iconoclastic zeal of the Puritans had destroyed or effaced much that was beautiful in them. Whitewash covered the walls and ceilings, and frequently obscured fine frescos and exquisite carvings in wood and stone. Hardly any new churches were erected during this period, though the nation had greatly increased in numbers. The machinery of the Church was totally inadequate to the work that lay before her. There were more parishes than clergy. Many of these were non-residents, and held two or three livings and sometimes more.

Valuable livings in the gift of lay patrons were generally bestowed upon younger sons as a means of providing for them. Such persons were appointed often with little regard to their fitness, and performed their duties in the most

perfunctory manner. Many of them lived lives that were a scandal to the community, and brought disgrace upon their calling.

A majority of the livings not yielding sufficient revenue to support clergymen of high education and social position, men were appointed who, in some instances, were deficient in even the elements of a good theological education, and whose manners were those of ploughmen. Rather than multiply this class of men, many who had the interests of the Church at heart, deemed the holding of pluralities a necessary evil; but the effect was to cause a dearth of religious instruction and spiritual oversight in many quarters. Non-residence was thus largely the rule. Many of the bishops were pluralists. Dr. Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, a Welsh See, was one of the most notorious in this respect. His mind was in theological matters, he tells us, wholly unbiassed. "I had no prejudice against, or predilection for, the Church of England." Having, however, a powerful backing, he was appointed to the See of Llandaff; but he never resided in his diocese,

living the life of a country gentleman on his farm. His boast was that through the various preferments that he held, he was the richest bishop in the Church.

It seems incredible, but it is the literal truth that for one hundred and fifty years after the Revolution, not a single Welshman was appointed to any Welsh diocese. The bishops of Welsh dioceses did not live among the people over whom they were supposed to exercise spiritual supervision; and the parish clergy, being free from all Episcopal oversight, became in many cases careless of their duties, and sometimes lived shockingly immoral lives. The Welsh bishops were, moreover, in the habit of appointing their relatives and personal friends to the rich livings. These incumbents were utterly out of sympathy with their flocks. They were unable to perform the Church service or preach in the Welsh language, and thus the people were weaned from the Church and drifted into various forms of Dissent. The Church of England to-day is reaping the harvest of this shameful system.

What was true in the Church of Wales was true in great measure of the Church in other parts of the country. Anglican Churchmen cannot but look back with a deep sense of shame at the state of things in the early part of the present century. The Church as a whole was suffering from spiritual inanition and deadness. As Sidney Smith phrased it, "it was dying of dignity." We who live in a time of great spiritual activity, such as the present, when Christianity, and particularly that phase of it which we understand by the Historic Church, daily justifies its existence by deeds of self-sacrifice and loving service in behalf of humanity, are unable to form any adequate conception of the state of the Church seven or eight decades ago. A second Reformation was necessary, and it came in a manner as unexpected as efficacious.

The beginning of the new movement must be dated from about the year 1830. In 1828, Parliament repealed the Corporation and Test Acts, and in the following year the Roman Catholic Emancipation Act was passed. These measures were regarded at the time as blows

aimed at the Established Church, but looking back upon them we can see that they were really an advantage to it. In the first place these acts removed a long-standing and just grievance of Nonconformity against the Church; and, secondly, they roused Churchmen to a sense of the dangers that were impending.

In 1830, the Whig party came into power, borne along by a great wave of reform. Reform in the State carried with it inevitably the idea of reform in the Church. An organized and popular attack was made upon the Establishment. The evils from which it was suffering were ruthlessly exposed. Speeches were made and pamphlets were written demanding the dis-establishment of the Church, or a curtailment of its privileges. The attack was so sudden and so violent, and the changes clamored for were so radical, that loyal Churchmen were thrown into a state of alarm bordering on consternation.

In 1832 the Reform Bill was passed, whereby seats in Parliament were thrown open not only

to Roman Catholics and Dissenters, but also to Rationalists, Unitarians, and in fact to all enemies of the Established Church, secret or avowed. When it is remembered that Parliament has the power to legislate for the Church, it will be seen what an element of danger to the well-being of the Church was thus introduced. Henceforth the appointments of archbishops, bishops, and other leading dignitaries of the Church, which were vested in the advisers of the Crown, might fall into the hands of the deadliest foes of the Church.

The bishops, who occupied seats in the Upper House and were entitled to votes, by their stubborn resistance to the cause of necessary reform, exasperated the public, and by their failure to effect a just compromise disgusted the friends of the Church. Many of them were publicly insulted. The residence of the Bishop of Bristol was burned by a mob. The popular indignation rose so high that it looked at one time as if there would be a permanent divorce between the Church and the

State, or that the Church would be reduced to the position of a mere department of the State. That danger was happily averted; but the anomaly remains of a Church subject to the control, at least in some degree, of those who repudiate all connection with it.

Perils threatened the Church from another quarter. We have spoken of a spirit of latitudinarianism in theology that was abroad. About this time this spirit began to manifest itself at Oxford. The leaders of this school were Whately, Hampden, and Dr. Arnold of Rugby. Among these Arnold was easily chief, and he may be called the father of the modern Broad Church party. He advocated a surrender to the Dissenters of almost everything in doctrine and practice that Churchmen regarded as vital. He took the most extreme Erastian view of the Church's relation to the State. The State, according to his theory, should have power to pass upon the doctrines of the Church. The solemn act of ordination was nothing more, in his opinion, than the method of appointing Church officers. The

Athanasian Creed he called "the provoking and ill-judged language of Trinitarians, and a stumbling block to good Unitarians." He advocated the joint use of parish churches by Churchmen and Dissenters, the former to use them in the morning and the latter in the afternoon. Not only Churchmen but many Dissenters were alarmed and shocked by these radical views.

But the Church was not left naked to the assaults of her foes. Beneath much apparent indifference there was a strong current of loyalty to the orthodox doctrine and practice of the Church. There were a few individuals far in advance of their fellows; men who were deeply read in the history of the Church, and had grasped firmly her Catholic position; men who believed in the Church and had the courage of their convictions; men who were respected for their deep learning and zeal, and unostentatious piety. These men formed a nucleus, around which those who loved the Church and believed in her divine mission could rally to her support. These

men felt it to be a fight for the Church's very life, and they believed it to be a cause well worth fighting for. To them, religion was a great and solemn fact; and religion, in their eyes, was identified with the Church in which they had been born and reared.

The limits of our space will not permit us to do more than to sketch very briefly the origin and growth of the Oxford movement. Keble, Pusey, Newman, Hurrell Froude, Isaac Williams, Hugh James Rose, and W. G. Ward were the men most prominent in it. Of these the first three were undoubtedly the leaders.

According to Newman, the beginning of the movement may be dated from an assize sermon on National Apostasy preached by Keble in St. Mary's Church, Oxford, July 14, 1833. "I have always," said Newman, "considered and kept that day as the start of the religious movement of 1833."

It became evident to all concerned that if the Church of England were to be saved, the line of defence must be drawn on principles other than those which the Evangelical or

Broad Church parties had to offer. The Evangelical movement which at one time had infused a measure of life into the Church, was on the wane, and the Broad Church party offered nothing but the most humiliating surrender of everything that Churchmen held dear. A new method, which was simply an old one, was therefore adopted. It consisted in an appeal to history. The idea of the Church as an Establishment had been so long and so strenuously insisted upon that it had dimmed the truth of the Catholic and Apostolic nature of the Church. It was to rescue the truth and place it sharply before the minds of Churchmen that the Tracts for the Times, as they were called, were written.

These tracts were published between 1833 and 1841, and were the work mainly of Newman, Pusey, Keble, and Isaac Williams. These men, with a few others, had formed an Association of the Friends of the Church, the object of which was "to maintain the rights of the Church and to withstand all deviations from the Primitive Church and Apostolic Rule." The first

tract dealt with the Apostolic Succession as the great central doctrine upon which all else depends, and claimed it as the heritage of the Church of England. This, it was asserted, was the strongest argument against the claims of both the Roman Catholics and the Dissenters. The neglect of the services of the Church, the infrequency of celebrations of the Holy Communion, and the disregard of Church festivals and fasts were subjects also touched upon. Other tracts dealt with the Sacraments and points of Catholic doctrine and ancient practice.

The movement thus begun spread rapidly over the country. It became everywhere a topic of conversation. The Tractarians were praised or abused as their ideas met with approval or disapprobation. At first, the movement did not excite any violent opposition; but as time went on, and men began to appreciate its trend and the strong influence that it was wielding over the minds of thousands, a bitter and determined opposition set in. The bishops of the Church almost to a man looked upon the movement with disfavor.

Finally, in the year 1841, with Tract Number Ninety, the series came to an end. This tract was entitled, "Remarks on Certain Passages in the Thirty-Nine Articles." It was an attempt to reconcile certain statements in the Articles, which had generally been interpreted in a Protestant sense, with ancient Catholic doctrine. The author was Newman. A protest was made against its teachings, and on March 15th of the same year it was condemned by the Oxford authorities.

At the request of Dr. Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, the tracts were then discontinued. But their work was accomplished; their silent influence had been enormous. They had brought long-forgotten truths to mind, and had educated the public. Henceforth the Church of England stood on a rock from which it was impossible to dislodge her, the rock of Catholic and Apostolic Truth. Humiliated and derided by her foes, crushed to the earth under the weight of her own shortcomings, only half believed in by many who accounted themselves her friends, she emerged at last from her trials

purified and strengthened. She had learned her lesson well. Henceforth she had no need to hang her head. She had fought a good fight, she had kept the Faith.

Of course much remained to be done—there were wounds to heal, prejudices to overcome, difficulties to adjust. But rid at last forever of the millstone that had hung about her neck, she was able to give herself with a brave heart and a strong hand to the work that lay before her. How nobly she has done that work, let the history of the renewed and purified life of the last fifty years answer.

What remains to be said concerning the sequel to the Oxford movement need not detain us long. As is usual in such matters, differences began to show themselves between the various leaders and their adherents. One section, with Newman at its head, was passing far beyond the original design of the movement, and was making rapid progress toward Rome. The utterances of several individuals comprising this section became more and more radical. In 1844, Ward published his Ideal of a Chris-

tian Church, in which he claimed to hold the whole cycle of Roman doctrines; and in February, 1845, he was condemned in the Oxford Convocation and deprived of his degree. Oakley, a friend and disciple of Newman's, wrote a letter to his Ordinary, the Bishop of London, in which he claimed to hold, as distinct from teaching, all Roman doctrines, and challenged the Bishop to take proceedings against him. The challenge was accepted, and Oakley was condemned. Newman himself, as he tells us in that charming self-revelation, "Apologia Pro Vita Sua," long had been contemplating going to Rome, and he took the final step on October 8, 1845. Oakley, Ward, Faber, Wiseman, and others soon followed.

These defections, and particularly that of Newman, who had been the leading spirit among the Tractarians throughout the movement, was a severe blow to the cause, and retarded its progress. But it is doubtful if any permanent loss was effected. The total number of priests of the English Church who have 'verted to Rome has been much exaggerated.

According to a list published in the *Whitehall Review*, the whole number of Anglican clergy who joined the Church of Rome from 1833 to 1878 was 385. This makes an average of less than twelve a year, and in a total number of clergy ranging from twenty to thirty thousand, is certainly inconsiderable. As an offset to these defections to Rome it might be stated that defections to Protestant Dissent, which during the Evangelical period were numerous, in a great measure ceased after the Tractarian movement. It is certainly true, also, that the recognition of the Catholicity of the English Church, and its claim to be equally with Rome a branch of the Apostolic Church, while it owns a purer doctrine and practice, operate as powerful forces to retain in the Church men of Catholic ideas. It is an open secret that conversions to Rome are growing less and less frequent in England. The Roman Mission has to struggle hard to hold its own.

The growth of the Church of England since the Oxford movement has been little short of marvellous. The growth has been not only in

numbers but also in spiritual strength and moral influence. New bishoprics have been created to provide for the welfare of a greatly increased membership. Thousands of church buildings have been erected out of the large personal gifts of Churchmen, and numerous organizations for educational and philanthropic purposes have been formed.

The Architectural Society, which was founded at Oxford in 1838, has done a good work in educating the popular taste in ecclesiastical building. Instead of the ugly and undevotional type of church edifices which was in vogue during the eighteenth century, there has been a return to the noble Gothic and other ancient styles of architecture. The unsightly three-decker pulpit, which was the most prominent feature in the eighteenth century church, and which impeded the view of the chancel and altar, has given place to a more modest and decorous style. The chancel itself has been enlarged, and the altar has reassumed its position of rightful prominence as the place where the great central Act of Wor-

ship is celebrated. The revival of ecclesiastical art has resulted also in bringing to light many elements of beauty in the cathedrals and parish churches which Puritan fanaticism had defaced or obliterated.

Church buildings have in many ways been enriched and beautified, and thus made more worthy as the dwelling-place of the Almighty and as the temple wherein He is worshipped. Christians have grown to perceive that a pure and spiritual worship is aided, not hindered, by the presence of all that is suggestive in devotion and beautiful in art. We have learned that externals have their rightful place and value in Christian worship. It seems strange, indeed, to us now that men should ever have thought otherwise. We now recognize clearly that "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," and we are no longer afraid to make use of everything that is beautiful, costly, and appropriate to dignify and adorn the earthy tabernacle of the Most High.

Hand in hand with this advance in the character and appearance of church edifices has

gone a marked improvement in the manner of conducting the public services of the Church. The festivals and fasts are observed with increasing regularity by more people. The Holy Eucharist is celebrated frequently; in many parishes, weekly. Many of the large city parishes have introduced the custom of daily morning and evening prayer. The old idea that it was sufficient to open the churches one day in the week for service, and proper to keep them closed under bolt and bar all the rest of the time is fast disappearing. Religion has ceased to be regarded as a matter solely for Sunday observance, and has come to be looked upon as a desirable thing for the other six days also.

The Ceremonial Revival, which is sometimes incorrectly designated as Ritualism, was the natural and inevitable outgrowth of the revival of Catholic doctrine and practice which began with the Oxford Movement. The Tractarians were in no sense what we should call "Ritualists." They were fighting for the very life of the Church, and with such a stake

at hazard they could not afford to spend any measure of their strength in a matter that was not of the most vital importance. It was necessary that people should be first brought to believe the doctrines of the Church, before they could receive those things which symbolized the doctrines. "It was useless," said Dr. Pusey, "to introduce ritual before doctrine had taken possession of the minds of the people. It was like giving children flowers which would fade, wither, and die immediately."

As the great Catholic truths for which the Church stands began to be more generally accepted, a revival of ceremonial and ritual practices set in.

Ritualism has, of course, had its extravagances, and its true mission has been thereby obscured. Foolish and headstrong advocates of it have gone to extremes, and often brought it into disrepute. A one-sided and violent insistence upon it as essential to the being of the Church has irritated and disgusted many loyal Churchmen. Ritual is the clothing of the Faith. It is not essential to its preservation

or integrity. It is an accessory to worship, and not the spirit of it. In default of authoritative rules upon the subject, a sanctified common sense will determine its proper limits. Speaking in a large sense, however, it may be said that if the Bride of Christ, the King's Daughter, be all glorious within, who shall say that her clothing should not be of wrought gold?

283P
Sch 89

Schuyler, Hamilton

Studies in English church history

11/1/50	Kier	JAN 26 '71			

283P
Sch 89